Iqbal Akhtar

Covenantal Pluralism

The Geopolitics of Interfaith Religious Freedom

OPEN ACCESS

Springer

Covenantal Pluralism

Iqbal Akhtar

Covenantal Pluralism

The Geopolitics of Interfaith Religious Freedom

Springer

Iqbal Akhtar
The East-West Foundation
Florida International University
Slidell and Miami, USA

ISBN 978-3-032-31478-9 ISBN 978-3-032-31479-6 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-31479-6

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2026. This book is an open access publication.

Open Access This book is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.
The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.
The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

If disposing of this product, please recycle the paper.

To my parents, Saleem and Nargis Akhtar, wife, Zafreen Jaffery, son, Århum, daughter, Nuru, brother, Aziz, sister-in-law, Farah, and nieces, Maryam and Amrah.
I love you all and could not have done this without you. And to my mentor, the late Satadru-da Sen, who guided me with compassion to intellectual rigor.
May auspicious blessings be upon our global family, peace for our ancestors, and guidance for our progeny. As the Prophet ﷺ said, "May we leave this world a better place than we found it."

Preface

The seeds of this book were planted during my tenure at the Templeton Religion Trust, where I had the extraordinary privilege of connecting with scholars, activists, and journalists engaged in the vital work of religious freedom and interfaith dialogue across the globe. Through these connections, I was able to witness firsthand the diverse manifestations of religious pluralism in practice, traveling to many countries to observe these projects up close. Among these experiences, my time in Indonesia proved most revelatory, offering profound insights into how an Islamic society oriented toward pluralism has achieved both economic prosperity and emerged as a compelling model of Muslim cosmopolitanism.

We live in an era of unprecedented global transformation—social, economic, and political forces are reshaping the world order as we know it. Within this context, the interfaith movement, which first took root in the Anglophone world, deserves renewed examination. Its modern origins can be traced to the World's Parliament of Religions convened in Chicago in September 1893, but America's contribution to both universalism and pluralism appeared even earlier in the 1797 Treaty of Tripoli. Article 11 of that treaty boldly declared:

"As the government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian Religion, as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religious or tranquility of Musselmen, and as the said States never have entered into any war or act of hostility against any Mehomitan nation, it is declared by the parties that no pretext arising from religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries."

This remarkable statement helped establish a new paradigm for international relations—one where religious freedom could serve as the foundation for engagement between nations. However, this vision became increasingly complicated by the European colonial experience, Protestant missionary activities, and eventually America's own interventionist foreign policy. Today, the rise of global China and the political reevaluation of state power challenge the durability of international norms and institutions, testing these Western-pioneered liberal concepts of human rights, religious freedom, and free speech as individual-based freedoms.

These ideas represent relatively recent developments in the long arc of recorded human history. Interfaith dialogue has an even shorter provenance. While humans have always constituted a multifaith community, popular global interfaith dialogue has only become possible through modernity—from the printing press to the first modern democratic experiment that began with the United States.

We now stand at a crucial juncture: the maturation and globalization of these concepts and ideas. The internationalization of interfaith dialogue presents both opportunities and challenges, as it may be appropriated by states for instrumental purposes that extend beyond its original aims of universalism and peacebuilding. Many contemporary interfaith efforts in global dialogues, such as those in Doha, have become largely procedural and performative. Yet the act itself remains transformational—the ritual of coming together as a community creates change regardless of whether the specific ideas and initiatives proposed by participants are ever realized. The objectives of interfaith engagement vary according to the interests of the participants, while questions of Western intentions and allegations of Western hypocrisy continue to shadow the movement, alongside critiques of its ineffectiveness in achieving peace or its tendency toward the watered-down theology of similarity that dominates public discourse at these gatherings.

This brings us to the fundamental questions that animate this work: Where is all of this headed? What are the geopolitical prerequisites for interfaith dialogue to succeed as a political intervention that promotes national pluralism? And perhaps most pressingly, can it contribute meaningfully to arguably the most pressing conflict that has come to consume the world- the Middle East or more generally the future of Jewish-Muslim relations?

This book represents my humble attempt to begin a conversation about the history, current role, and future trajectory of the global interfaith religious freedom movement. It is an invitation to think more deeply about how we might navigate the complex terrain of religious pluralism in an interconnected yet fractured world, and to consider what covenantal pluralism might offer as both a framework for understanding and a path forward.

Slidell and Miami, USA Iqbal Akhtar

Acknowledgements I am incredibly grateful to my Templeton colleagues who supported me through this journey of learning from the leadership and steering committee to the bank board:

Wendy Cadge, Gregory Cleare, Mark Deal, Jeffrey Dill, Heather Dill, Robert Emmons, Sean Farrington, Dennis Hoover, Nidhal Guessoum, Shadi Hamid, Lynn Holowesko, Robert Lotmore, Avery Lloyd, Katherine Marshall, Donald Miller, Eboo Patel, Ali Qadir, Zeenat Rahman, Betty Roberts, David Saperstein, John Schott, Chris Seiple, Jane Siebels, Jennifer Simpson, Richard Sosis, Kim Tan, Miroslav Volf, Leslie Willmore, and Charlotte Witvliet

And to my Bahamian family:

Tadd T. Albury, Denine Cambridge, Tina Cambridge, DeAndra Cartwright, Melinda Cartwright, Sharell Carroll, Alyssa Cleare, Sandra Darville, Demetrius Delancy, Kristin Eldon-Whylly, Rhandi Elliott, Tracey Farquharson, Vochelle Ferguson, Sheena Fox, Kesha Frank, Vonetta L. Glover, Kara Ingraham, Giavana Jones, Lashanti Jupp, Shanelle Knowles, Sarah Major, Eric Marshall, V. Amanda Marray, Dephanie T. Moss, Bianca Munroe, Nakia Pearson, Udayan Roy, Kimon Sargeant, Andrew C. Serazin, Revanno Smith, Andrica Smith-Munroe, Juliette Smith-Munroe, Karen Sommer-Shalett, Marie Souder, Christ Stewart, Jean-Patrice Sweeting, Jon-Travis Sweeting, & Ereoshi Turnquest

Competing Interests The author has no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this manuscript.

Contents

1 Introduction: Covenantal Pluralism 1

2 The Polycrisis 11

3 Religion 33

4 Practical Theory 73

5 Interfaith Futures 97

6 Conclusion 121

Afterword: Lessons From the Gaza War and the Future of Interfaith Peacebuilding 131

Bibliography 143

Chapter 1
Introduction: Covenantal Pluralism

Introduction

"You are going to hell."

These were the first words I remember hearing from a Christian child as I entered first grade in Louisiana, forty minutes north of New Orleans, near Lake Pontchartrain. It was 1995, and I was seven years old. The words cut through the humid September air of the schoolyard with a certainty that startled me—not because I understood their theological implications, but because of the casual cruelty with which they were delivered. At seven, I had no framework for understanding damnation, but I understood rejection.

We lived near Stennis Space Center, where my father worked as an engineer after arriving in the United States in 1979. Our family embodied the complexities of global migration and interfaith identity: my mother's Tanzanian family was Khoja Shia, tracing their roots through the Indian Ocean trading networks that connected East Africa to the subcontinent; my father's Pakistani family was Punjabi Sunni, carrying the cultural heritage of the fertile plains that had witnessed countless conquests and conversions. My parents had met in London—that great cosmopolitan crossroads of empire—before making their way to the American South, where schools were legally integrated but communities remained divided by invisible yet impermeable lines of race, religion, and belonging.

The Louisiana of my childhood was a place where the past lived alongside the present in uncomfortable proximity. Our mosque served a small but diverse Muslim community, led by an Imam whose own story reflected America's complex racial history. He was a convert to Islam; his family descended from the old Creole elite that had been displaced by the railroad's arrival and the systematic restructuring of Southern society. His mother carried Choctaw heritage, and he had been classified as Black during the era of segregation while his father was considered White—a stark reminder of how arbitrary and yet how consequential racial categories could be. Having left his family's ancestral lands on the Northshore of Lake Pontchartrain,

© The Author(s) 2026

I. Akhtar, *Covenantal Pluralism*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-31479-6_1

he fought against the racial injustices he encountered with the spiritual strength of his mother's Indigenous ancestors and the theological framework of his adopted faith.

This personal history illuminated a larger truth that would shape my understanding of American religious life: Islam's presence in America predates the nation's founding. From the Spanish Moriscos of the fifteenth century to the enslaved Muslims of the antebellum South, from the early twentieth-century migrations to the post-1965 waves of immigration, Islam has been part of America's story. Like all American religious traditions—Christianity, Judaism, Native American spiritualities—Islam has undergone its own journey of importation, contestation, and gradual assimilation into the broader American experiment.

But it was September 11, 2001, that truly awakened me to the precarious nature of religious pluralism in America and around the world. The tragedy of that day became, almost immediately, an opportunity for political entrepreneurs across the spectrum to reveal their latent prejudices and exploit communal fears. In the weeks and months that followed, American Muslims experienced something approaching an existential crisis. We felt genuinely threatened—not just by the stigma and suspicion that surrounded us, but by concrete manifestations of state power. Surveillance programs targeting our communities, watch lists that included the names of ordinary citizens whose only crime was sharing a faith with the perpetrators, and the launch of what would become two decades of military intervention in predominantly Muslim countries.

The psychological impact was cataclysmic. On Fox News and other media outlets, commentators openly discussed the possibility of internment camps for Muslims—a conversation that seemed to transform overnight from unthinkable to merely controversial. To become an existential threat to one's own society, to watch neighbors and colleagues suddenly view your presence as potentially dangerous, creates a particular form of alienation that is difficult to convey to those who have never experienced it. It forced many American Muslims, myself included, to become simultaneously less visibly Islamic in public spaces while becoming more consciously Muslim in terms of identity and community solidarity. This paradox—the simultaneous suppression and intensification of religious identity under pressure—would prove to be one of the defining features of the post-9/11 era.

Perhaps most significantly, these events accelerated what scholars would later recognize as the racialization of Islam in America. Muslim identity began to function less like traditional religious affiliation and more like racial or ethnic identity—something visible, permanent, and politically significant. Within America's persistent Black-White racial binary, Muslims found themselves increasingly positioned as a kind of intermediate category, neither fully White nor Black, but definitely "other" in ways that carried both social stigma and political consequence.

Yet even in those dark years, I witnessed something that would profoundly shape my understanding of what pluralism could look like at its best. The Japanese American community, drawing on their own painful memories of internment during World War II, emerged as some of the most vocal defenders of Muslim civil rights. They organized legal challenges, public protests, and educational campaigns, explicitly connecting their historical experience to our contemporary struggle. Many members

of Reform Jewish communities similarly mobilized to protest the Muslim Ban (Executive Order 13769) and provide practical assistance to Muslim immigrants facing detention or deportation. This was interfaith solidarity in action: communities that had themselves been victimized in the past stepping forward to protect those being wronged in the present, not because of shared theology or cultural affinity, but because of shared commitment to the principles of religious freedom and human dignity.

These experiences—the casual cruelty of childhood religious prejudice, the institutional suspicion of the post-9/11 era, and the surprising solidarity of interfaith coalition-building—became the foundation for my lifelong engagement with questions of religious pluralism. They taught me that religious diversity is neither automatically harmonious nor inevitably conflictual, but rather something that must be actively cultivated, protected, and renewed in each generation (Eck, 2001; Putnam & Campbell, 2010).

The Crisis of Contemporary Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism, as it emerged in the late twentieth century, represented an ambitious attempt to reconcile the tension between unity and diversity that has plagued diverse societies throughout history (Kymlicka, 1995; Parekh, 2000). At its core, multiculturalism proposed that societies could simultaneously respect the equal validity of different cultural traditions while maintaining strong commitments to individual rights and democratic governance. It suggested that hyphenated identities—African-American, Irish-American, Muslim-American—could coexist peacefully within a shared civic framework, each contributing to a richer, more vibrant national culture (Alba & Nee, 2003).

Today, however, this multicultural consensus is under severe strain. Across the Western world, we are witnessing what can only be described as a comprehensive backlash against the ideals and institutions of cultural relativism (Goodhart, 2017; Kaufmann, 2018). The discourse of diversity, equity, and inclusion—once championed by mainstream institutions from corporations to universities—has become politically toxic in many contexts. Political movements explicitly committed to cultural homogeneity and demographic preservation have gained ground from the United States to Hungary, from India to Brazil (Norris & Inglehart, 2019).

This backlash reflects a deeper challenge that multiculturalism has never adequately addressed: the asymmetry between progressive and conservative political psychology (Haidt, 2012; Jost et al., 2003). Progressivism, at its core, is oriented toward change, toward the expansion of rights and opportunities, toward the inclusion of previously marginalized voices. But progressivism often lacks what we might call a foundational mythology—a compelling story about why change is not only necessary but legitimate and desirable. Conservatism, by contrast, draws its power from appeals to tradition, to the "way of the ancestors," to an imagined past when communities were more cohesive, values more widely shared, and social roles more clearly defined (Hirschman, 1991).

The conservative advantage in this contest is significant because it taps into a fundamental human psychological need: the need for stability, predictability, and belonging (Hogg, 2007; Stenner, 2005). When people feel unmoored from their traditional sources of meaning—extended family, local community, religious congregation—they often seek to restore that sense of groundedness by returning to an idealized past. The constant pace of social and technological change in modern societies exacerbates this psychological need, creating what we might call a "stability deficit" that conservative movements are particularly well-positioned to address (Giddens, 1991).

The result is a political dynamic in which advocates for pluralism and inclusion find themselves perpetually on the defensive, forced to justify change against the emotional appeal of restoration. This is a difficult position because it requires making rational arguments against what are fundamentally emotional and spiritual needs—the needs for community, for meaning, for a sense of place in the cosmic order.

The Technological Acceleration of Fragmentation

The challenges facing contemporary pluralistic societies are not merely political; they are also deeply technological. The twin revolutions in transportation and information technology that have defined the past century have created unprecedented opportunities for human contact across cultural, religious, and national boundaries. We can now communicate instantaneously with people on the other side of the globe, travel between continents in a matter of hours, and access virtually unlimited information about different ways of life and belief.

Paradoxically, however, these same technologies have also contributed to a homogenization of human experience, particularly in urban centers (Castells, 2010; Sassen, 2001). Global cities from New York to Dubai to Singapore increasingly resemble one another—featuring the same international brands, architectural styles, and professional cultures. This homogenization has produced what sociologists call "deculturation"—the gradual erosion of distinctive local traditions, languages, and ways of life in favor of a globalized consumer culture (Appadurai, 1996; Ritzer, 2019).

Deculturation represents a profound shift in how human identity is constructed and maintained. Traditional societies organized identity around what we might call "involuntary bindings"—the soil of one's birthplace, the blood of one's family, the faith of one's ancestors (Anderson, 1983; Smith, 1963). These bindings were not chosen; they were inherited, and they provided a stable foundation for both individual identity and community solidarity.

Modern urban societies, by contrast, increasingly organize identity around voluntary associations—friend groups, professional networks, lifestyle communities, political movements (Bauman, 2001; Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 2002). These voluntary relationships offer greater freedom and flexibility, but they also place enormous psychological burdens on individuals, who must constantly construct and maintain

their own sense of self and belonging without the supporting structures that traditional communities provided.

The decline of traditional religious communities exemplifies this broader trend. In many Western societies, religious affiliation has become increasingly voluntary, individualized, and fluid (Davie, 2002; Heelas & Woodhead, 2005). People "shop" for religious communities that match their personal preferences and values, rather than inheriting religious identity from their families and communities. While this shift has created new opportunities for spiritual exploration and interfaith encounter, it has also contributed to the fragmentation of religious authority and the proliferation of competing truth claims within and across religious traditions.

This fragmentation is exacerbated by digital communication technologies that enable the formation of ideological echo chambers (Pariser, 2011; Sunstein, 2017). Rather than promoting greater understanding across differences, social media platforms often reinforce existing beliefs and prejudices by connecting like-minded individuals while filtering out dissenting voices. The result is a paradox: we live in an era of unprecedented connectivity and yet experience levels of political polarization not seen since the civil wars of the nineteenth century (McCarty et al., 2016).

Freud's concept of the "narcissism of small differences" helps explain this phenomenon (Freud, 1930; Ignatieff, 1993). As societies become more similar in material terms—sharing similar technologies, economic systems, and cultural products—the remaining differences between groups often become more, not less, politically significant. Groups that are similar to one another often experience more intense rivalry than groups that are obviously different, because similar groups threaten each other's distinctiveness in ways that obviously different groups do not.

This dynamic is clearly visible in contemporary American politics, where Republicans and Democrats live increasingly similar lives—working similar jobs, consuming similar media, shopping at similar stores—while experiencing their political differences as fundamental and irreconcilable. It is also visible in global politics, where the rivalry between the United States and China is often framed in civilizational terms despite the fact that both societies are committed to technological modernization, economic growth, and global influence.

The Geopolitical Context of Religious Freedom

Religious pluralism cannot be understood apart from the broader geopolitical context in which it operates. The current global order, constructed in the aftermath of World War II and expanded after the Cold War's end, has been dominated by Western liberal democratic values, including commitments to individual human rights, religious freedom, and cultural tolerance. These values have been promoted not only through diplomatic and economic pressure but also through military intervention, international development programs, and global civil society networks.

However, this Western-dominated order is now under challenge from multiple directions. The rise of China as a global superpower offers an alternative model of

governance that prioritizes economic development and social stability over individual rights and political freedom (Bell, 2015; Zhao, 2010). The resurgence of authoritarian movements within established democracies suggests that even Western societies are questioning their commitment to liberal values (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). And the failure of Western interventions in Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, and other countries has undermined confidence in the West's ability to promote its values effectively abroad (Mearsheimer, 2018).

From the perspective of many societies in what development scholars now call the "Majority World"—the countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America that contain most of the world's population—Western promotion of religious freedom and pluralism often appears hypocritical or self-serving (Anghie, 2005; Mutua, 2002). These societies point to the continued discrimination faced by religious minorities in Western countries, the use of religious freedom discourse to justify military interventions, and the historical connection between Christian missionary activity and colonial domination.

This skepticism is not merely political; it reflects deeper philosophical differences about the nature of individual rights, community obligations, and religious authority (An-Na'im, 2008; Sen, 1999). Many societies outside the West organize themselves around communitarian rather than individualistic principles, emphasizing collective welfare over individual autonomy and viewing religious traditions as inherited aspects of cultural identity rather than matters of personal choice.

The challenge for advocates of religious pluralism is to develop approaches that can speak to these different philosophical traditions without imposing Western assumptions about the primacy of individual rights. This requires moving beyond the liberal framework that has dominated Western thinking about religious freedom toward more inclusive models that can accommodate different understandings of the relationship between individual and community, tradition and change, religious authority and personal conscience.

Toward Covenantal Pluralism

It is in this context that the concept of "covenantal pluralism" becomes relevant. Developed by scholars and practitioners associated with the Templeton Religion Trust, covenantal pluralism attempts to bridge the gap between Western individualistic approaches to religious freedom and more communitarian approaches that emphasize collective identity and mutual obligation.

The term "covenant" is drawn from the Hebrew Bible and refers to the binding relationship between God and the people of Israel, characterized by mutual obligations and shared destiny. In political theory, covenant has been used to describe relationships of mutual accountability and shared responsibility that go deeper than mere contractual arrangements. Covenantal pluralism extends this concept to describe the kind of relationships that different religious communities might have with one

another—relationships characterized not merely by tolerance or respect, but by active commitment to each other's flourishing.

At Its Core, Covenantal Pluralism Rests on Three Key Principles

Humility in Theology: The recognition that human understanding of divine truth is necessarily limited and that encountering other religious traditions can deepen rather than threaten one's own faith commitments (Race, 2001; Templeton, 1998). This principle draws on the work of Sir John Templeton, who argued that theological humility is essential for both spiritual growth and peaceful coexistence.

Cross-Cultural Religious Literacy: The development of substantive knowledge about different religious traditions, not merely as an academic exercise but as preparation for meaningful relationship and cooperation across religious boundaries (Moore, 2007; Prothero, 2007). This goes beyond superficial familiarity with different traditions to include understanding of their internal diversity, historical development, and contemporary challenges.

Character Development: The cultivation of virtues—patience, compassion, courage, wisdom—that enable people to engage constructively with difference and disagreement (Sherman, 1997; Yearley, 1990). Covenantal pluralism recognizes that successful interfaith relationships depend not only on knowledge and good intentions but on the character traits that enable people to persevere through misunderstanding, conflict, and disappointment.

These principles distinguish covenantal pluralism from both liberal tolerance and multicultural celebration. Unlike liberal tolerance, covenantal pluralism does not require religious communities to privatize their deepest commitments or treat all truth claims as equally valid. Unlike multicultural celebration, covenantal pluralism does not assume that all cultural practices are equally valuable or that differences should be celebrated uncritically.

Instead, covenantal pluralism asks religious communities to engage with one another as they actually are—with their distinctive truth claims, practices, and commitments—while developing the relationships of trust and mutual accountability that can sustain cooperation across deep differences. It recognizes that such relationships cannot be mandated by government policy or created through short-term educational programs, but must be cultivated over time through patient relationship-building at the grassroots level.

The Indonesian Model and Beyond

The theoretical framework of covenantal pluralism finds its most compelling contemporary Muslim expression in the case of Indonesia, the world's largest Muslim-majority country and third-largest democracy (Hefner, 2000; Mietzner, 2009). Despite its incredible diversity—more than 17,000 islands, 300 ethnic groups, and significant Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, and Confucian minorities—Indonesia has maintained relative religious harmony and democratic stability since the fall of the Suharto regime in 1998.

Indonesia's success rests on a unique combination of factors that offer lessons for other diverse societies (Bertrand, 2004; Ramage, 1995). The country's founding ideology, Pancasila, explicitly embraces diversity as a source of strength rather than weakness. Its governmental institutions consistently promote pluralistic values while providing practical support for minority communities. Its civil society organizations actively work to build relationships across religious and ethnic boundaries. And its growing economy provides the material foundation for hope and mutual investment in the future.

However, Indonesia's model cannot simply be copied by other societies. The specific historical, geographical, and cultural factors that have enabled Indonesian pluralism are not easily replicated elsewhere (Aspinall, 2009; Liddle, 1996). Moreover, Indonesia's success is not guaranteed; the country faces ongoing challenges from extremist movements, economic inequality, and regional separatism that could undermine its pluralistic achievements.

The question this book addresses is whether the principles that have enabled Indonesian pluralism—and the broader theoretical framework of covenantal pluralism—can be adapted to other contexts, particularly in an era of rising authoritarianism, increasing inequality, and accelerating climate change (Diamond, 2015; Klein, 2014; Piketty, 2014). Can societies learn to live peacefully across religious differences when they are competing for scarce resources? Can democratic institutions survive the psychological pressures of rapid social change and technological disruption? Can religious communities maintain their distinctive identities while participating in pluralistic societies?

The Structure of This Book

This book approaches these questions through four interconnected analyses. Chapter 1 examines what I call the "polycrisis"—the intersection of political, economic, environmental, and spiritual challenges that characterize our historical moment. It argues that religious pluralism cannot be understood apart from these broader crises and that addressing them requires drawing on spiritual as well as material resources.

Chapter 2 develops the theoretical framework of covenantal pluralism, exploring both its potential contributions and its limitations. It examines the sources of resistance to pluralistic approaches and considers how these might be addressed without compromising the integrity of different religious traditions.

Chapter 3 applies this framework to concrete policy questions, examining how governments, civil society organizations, and religious communities can work together to promote peaceful coexistence across religious differences. It draws lessons from successful cases like Indonesia while also examining failures and setbacks in other contexts.

Chapter 4 looks toward the future, considering how global trends—particularly the rise of Asia, the effects of climate change, and the development of artificial intelligence—might affect the prospects for religious pluralism in the coming decades. It argues that the future of pluralism will likely be determined not in the West but in the rapidly growing and increasingly influential societies of Africa and Asia.

The book concludes with a reflection on the Gaza War and its implications for Jewish-Muslim relations globally. The collapse of interfaith dialogue initiatives following October 7, 2023, illustrates both the fragility of pluralistic achievements and the urgent need for more robust approaches to interfaith engagement.

Throughout, this book maintains that religious pluralism is not merely a nice ideal but a practical necessity for human survival in an interconnected world (Huntington, 1996; Norberg-Hodge, 2019). In an era of weapons of mass destruction, global climate change, and instant communication, we literally cannot afford the luxury of religious hatred and conflict. The choice before us is not between uniformity and diversity, but between pluralism and destruction.

The path toward covenantal pluralism will not be easy. It requires moving beyond both naive optimism about the natural harmony of different traditions and cynical pessimism about the possibility of peaceful coexistence. It requires developing new institutions, practices, and relationships that can sustain cooperation across deep differences. And it requires a kind of spiritual maturity that recognizes our fundamental interdependence while respecting our irreducible distinctiveness.

But the alternative—a world divided into competing civilizational blocs, each convinced of its own righteousness and the other's evil—is simply unacceptable. The stakes are too high, the weapons too powerful, and the planet too small for such a future. We must find a way to live together across our differences, or we will surely perish in our divisions.

This book is my humble contribution to that essential task.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

Chapter 2
The Polycrisis

Introduction: Mapping the Interconnected Crisis

The world stands at an unprecedented convergence of crises. What some scholars term the "polycrisis" represents not merely multiple simultaneous challenges, but a web of interconnected breakdowns that amplify and accelerate one another in ways that exceed our traditional capacity for response (Homer-Dixon et al., 2022; Lawrence et al., 2022). This is not hyperbole but empirical reality: climate change accelerates migration, which fuels political polarization, which undermines international cooperation, which weakens our collective capacity to address climate change. Economic inequality erodes social cohesion, which destabilizes democratic institutions, which enables the capture of economic policy by elites, which further increases inequality.

Religious pluralism—the ability of diverse faith communities to coexist peacefully within shared political frameworks—sits at the intersection of all these crises (Norris & Inglehart, 2019; Putnam & Campbell, 2010). Economic stress increases religious conflict; political polarization weaponizes religious difference; climate displacement creates new forms of cultural encounter; technological disruption fragments traditional religious authority. Understanding how these dynamics interact is essential for developing sustainable approaches to interfaith cooperation in an age of polycrisis.

This chapter maps the terrain of our interconnected challenges, with particular attention to how they affect the prospects for religious coexistence and cooperation. We examine the return to global multipolarity, the transformation of identity into a form of political religion, the spiritual dimensions of economic and environmental crisis, and the psychological and social foundations of our current predicament. Throughout, we maintain that technical and political solutions alone will prove inadequate without attention to the spiritual and communal dimensions of human flourishing.

© The Author(s) 2026

I. Akhtar, *Covenantal Pluralism*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-31479-6_2

A Return to Multipolarity: The Fragmentation of Global Order

The conventional framing of contemporary global politics into easily understood blocs—East versus West, democracy versus authoritarianism, liberalism versus illiberalism—fundamentally mischaracterizes the complexity of our return to multipolarity (Acharya, 2014; Kupchan, 2012). This binary thinking reflects what international relations scholars call the "unipolar moment" of American hegemony following the Cold War's end, when a single superpower could impose a relatively coherent global order (Krauthammer, 1990; Wohlforth, 1999).

Today's reality is far messier. We inhabit a world where authoritarian governments can be economically dynamic (Singapore, China), democratic governments can be internationally destructive (the United States under George W. Bush), secular societies can be culturally intolerant (France's treatment of Muslims), and religious societies can be politically pluralistic (Indonesia, India). The categories that organized political thinking during the twentieth century—left/right, secular/religious, democratic/authoritarian—no longer map neatly onto geopolitical alignments or policy outcomes.

This conceptual confusion reflects deeper structural changes in the global system. The Great Recession of 2008–2009 marked a watershed moment that revealed the contradictions at the heart of neoliberal democratic capitalism (Stiglitz, 2016; Tooze, 2018). Rather than a temporary market correction, the financial crisis exposed systematic dysfunction: a preference for bailing out oligarchic financial institutions while imposing austerity on working-class populations, the capture of regulatory agencies by the industries they were meant to oversee, and the conversion of public goods into private profit centers.

The political consequences of this economic betrayal have been profound and enduring. Across the developed world, citizens lost faith not merely in particular governments but in the capacity of democratic institutions to represent their interests against entrenched elites (Foa & Mounk, 2016; Norris, 2011). This disillusionment created the conditions for what political scientists call "competitive authoritarianism"—systems that maintain the forms of democracy while gutting its substance through voter suppression, media capture, judicial politicization, and civil society restriction (Bermeo, 2016; Levitsky & Way, 2010).

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated these authoritarian tendencies by providing justification for emergency powers that were often extended beyond their initial public health rationale (Greer et al., 2021; Lührmann & Rooney, 2021). More fundamentally, the pandemic revealed the extent to which supposed democracies had become what political economists call "plutocracies"—systems where wealthy elites exercise disproportionate political influence through campaign contributions, lobbying, and regulatory capture (Gilens & Page, 2014; Winters, 2011).

The resulting political anger has taken different forms in different contexts, but everywhere it reflects what psychologists recognize as "dignity deficits"—the sense that one's voice is not heard, one's concerns are not taken seriously, and one's social

and economic contribution is not recognized or rewarded (Fukuyama, 2018; Sennett, 2003). This psychological dimension of contemporary political crisis cannot be addressed through technical policy solutions alone; it requires what religious traditions call recognition of the full humanity of all persons—their capacity for moral agency, spiritual growth, and meaningful contribution to community life.

The challenges facing democratic systems have been compounded by what demographers describe as the "great demographic transition"—unprecedented population aging in developed countries combined with continued population growth in developing regions (Coleman, 2006; Goldstone, 2010). This demographic shift has created profound anxiety among majority populations in wealthy countries, who increasingly experience immigration and cultural change as existential threats rather than sources of renewal and enrichment.

Demographic anxiety manifests in multiple ways: nostalgia for an imagined past when communities were supposedly more homogeneous and cohesive; resentment toward immigrants and minorities who are blamed for economic insecurity and cultural change; and support for political movements that promise to restore demographic and cultural dominance through exclusionary policies (Kaufmann, 2010; Mutz, 2018). These dynamics have strengthened what sociologists call "ethnic nationalism"—identity based on blood, soil, and cultural inheritance rather than civic ideals and inclusive institutions (Brubaker, 2004; Smith, 1963).

The human cost of this zero-sum mentality is visible in tragic scenes across the globe: boats carrying asylum-seekers capsizing in the Mediterranean Sea, migrants dying from exposure in the Sonoran Desert, families separated at borders, and the systematic dehumanization of displaced persons through language, policy, and physical detention (Fassin, 2012). These tragedies reflect not merely policy failures but what theologians recognize as spiritual deformation—the corruption of moral imagination that occurs when societies lose their capacity for what Christians call "radical hospitality and Muslims call karam (generosity toward the stranger).

Nationality has increasingly "cut across the shared bonds of humanity," creating what international relations scholars term "moral particularism"—the belief that we owe greater obligations to co-nationals than to fellow human beings (Miller, 2007; Ypi, 2012). This particularism directly contradicts the universalistic teachings of all major religious traditions, which insist on the fundamental dignity and equal worth of all persons regardless of tribal, ethnic, or national affiliation.

Liberal democracy faces structural challenges that extend beyond partisan polarization to fundamental questions about its capacity for effective governance in an era of complex, long-term, transnational challenges (Papadopoulos, 2013; Schmidt, 2020). Democratic systems' reliance on short-term electoral cycles creates systematic biases against policies requiring immediate sacrifice for long-term benefit—precisely the kind of thinking needed to address climate change, infrastructure investment, demographic transition, and technological disruption.

The Norwegian Government Pension Fund Global offers a rare example of successful long-term democratic planning, but its success required exceptional circumstances: vast oil wealth, small homogeneous population, strong bureaucratic institutions, and broad social consensus about distributive justice (Holden, 2013;

Cappelen & Mjøset, 2009). These conditions are difficult to replicate in larger, more diverse, more polarized societies.

Most resource-rich countries have fallen victim to what economists call the resource curse"—the paradoxical tendency for natural resource wealth to undermine rather than promote economic development and democratic governance (Ross, 2012; Sachs & Warner, 2001). Countries like Venezuela, Russia, and Nigeria have used hydrocarbon revenues to finance politically popular but economically unsustainable policies—fuel subsidies, employment guarantee schemes, corruption networks—rather than investing in education, infrastructure, and institutional development.

The absence of a functional political center in many democratic systems has made compromise and long-term planning increasingly difficult (Hacker & Pierson, 2005; McCarty et al., 2016). In the United States, hyperpolarization affects not just electoral competition but basic governmental operations: budget processes, judicial appointments, administrative rule-making, and public health responses. The result is what political scientists call competitive dysfunction—a system that generates conflict and gridlock rather than effective problem-solving.

The Post-Cold War Disillusionment

The end of the Cold War and the supposed "victory" of capitalist democracy failed to deliver the prosperity, freedom, and dignity that newly liberated societies had been promised (Fukuyama, 2018; Mazower, 2012). The "third wave" of democratization that swept across Eastern Europe, Latin America, Africa, and Asia during the 1980s and 1990s often produced what scholars call "illiberal democracy"—electoral systems without meaningful constraints on majority power or protection for minority rights (Diamond, 2002; Zakaria, 1997).

More than half a century of decolonization raises troubling questions about whether the nation-state model has created genuinely liberal polities or simply empowered new majorities to oppress minorities through democratic means (Mamdani, 2012; Young, 2012). The Westphalian system of territorial nation-states, developed from European experiences of religious warfare, proved poorly suited to the ethnic, linguistic, and religious diversity characteristic of most postcolonial societies.

From the Western Sahara to West Timor, the creation of "peoples" through ethnic, racial, or religious classification has often furthered economic underdevelopment and political mismanagement rather than promoting human flourishing (Anderson, 1983; Herbst, 2000). The development of nation-states has led to increased competition for resources and the fragmentation of identities, resulting in neighbors being viewed as threats rather than sources of mutual enrichment and support.

The liberal project of creating universal institutions based on individual rights and market economics has been systematically undermined by the very powers that claimed to champion it (Ikenberry, 2018; Patrick, 2014). U.S.-led interventions in

Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, and other countries violated principles of sovereignty and international law that the United States had previously promoted, creating widespread perceptions of hypocrisy that have weakened Western moral authority globally.

Much of the Global South now views American promotion of democracy and human rights as what Muslims call nifaq (hypocrisy)—one of the most serious moral failings in Islamic ethics (Aydin, 2019; Pasha, 2017). This perception has been reinforced by continued Western support for authoritarian regimes when it serves strategic interests (Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Kazakhstan) and by obvious double standards applied to different conflicts and humanitarian crises.

The norms-based liberal international order has been replaced by what international relations scholars call "competitive multilateralism"—overlapping and often contradictory institutional arrangements that reflect power relationships rather than shared principles (Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, 2021). China's Belt and Road Initiative exemplifies this new approach: economic relationships based on transaction rather than transformation, investment without ideological conditionality, infrastructure development without governance reform.

The emergence of what analysts term a "new Cold War" between the United States and China has fundamentally altered the context for international cooperation on global challenges (Allison, 2017; Brands, 2018). Unlike the original Cold War, however, this competition occurs within an interconnected global economy where complete decoupling is neither feasible nor desirable for either side.

The technological "decoupling" between what some analysts call the "Sinosphere" and "Anglosphere" is creating parallel systems of innovation, production, and governance that may define global politics for generations (Farrell & Newman, 2019; Roberts et al., 2021). This bifurcation has particular implications for religious freedom and pluralism, as different spheres develop different approaches to managing diversity, dissent, and minority rights.

Yet paradoxically, we also see what might be called ideological convergence across national boundaries mediated by digital communication technologies. The ping-pong effect of discourses—where immigration anxiety spreads from Europe to America to Asia, or where environmental activism moves from indigenous communities to urban youth movements—represents a form of global realignment by ideological orientation rather than national interest. In some cases, the German Alternative für Deutschland has more in common with the U.S. Republican Party than with Germany's Social Democratic Party.

This creates a complex landscape where physical production and digital ideology are moving in opposite directions: economic decoupling combined with cultural convergence, technological competition combined with social movement coordination, geopolitical rivalry combined with transnational identity formation.

Identity as Political Religion: The Sacralization of Secular Politics

Identity has emerged as the dominant organizing principle of twenty-first-century politics, functioning less like traditional political ideology and more like religious faith (Fukuyama, 2018; Lilla, 2016). This transformation reflects what sociologists call the "transfer of the sacred" from traditional religious institutions to political movements, lifestyle choices, and identity categories (Heelas & Woodhead, 2005; Lynch, 2007).

The rise of "nones"—people claiming no religious affiliation—has coincided with the intensification of political identity as a source of meaning, community, and moral purpose (Putnam & Campbell, 2010; Hout & Fischer, 2014). Political movements increasingly exhibit characteristics traditionally associated with religious communities: sacred texts and founding narratives, ritual observances and calendar celebrations, moral authorities and heresy accusations, conversion experiences and excommunication practices.

This sacralization of politics helps explain why contemporary political disagreements take on apocalyptic dimensions, with opponents viewed not as fellow citizens with different policy preferences but as existential threats to one's identity and way of life (Mason, 2018; Iyengar et al., 2019). The language and symbols of traditional religion become incorporated into political movements while being stripped of their spiritual content and transcendent orientation.

Political polarization can thus be understood through what religious studies scholars call the "new religious movements" paradigm—the emergence of distinct communities with their own truth claims, moral systems, and salvation narratives (Lynch, 2007; Partridge, 2004). Like traditional religious movements, these political communities provide answers to fundamental questions about meaning, purpose, and belonging that secular institutions have failed to address adequately.

Religion itself has increasingly become what sociologists call an "identity brand"—something purchased and displayed rather than practiced and embodied (Einstein, 2008; Hoover & Echchaibi, 2014). This commodification strips religious traditions of their transformative power while retaining their symbolic and social functions. Liking religion on social media replaces the difficult work of spiritual discipline and character development that traditional communities demanded.

This branding process helps explain seemingly paradoxical phenomena like Donald Trump's appeal to evangelical Christians despite his obvious lack of personal piety or consistent theological commitment. Trump functions as what Max Weber called a "charismatic leader"—someone who embodies the aspirations and resentments of followers regardless of personal character or ideological consistency (Norris & Inglehart, 2019; Weber, 1947). His appeal is vox populi vox Dei—the voice of the people as the voice of God—rather than traditional religious authority based on theological learning or spiritual exemplarity.

Most traditional religions grounded identity in community practice and mutual accountability. They provided moral exemplars to emulate (Muhammad, Jesus,

Buddha, Mahavira) and communal processes for addressing inevitable human failures through repentance, forgiveness, and restoration. When individuals fell short of religious ideals, communities offered both challenge and support for continued growth.

Contemporary identity politics, by contrast, often lacks these communal structures for moral formation and spiritual development. Individual autonomy becomes an end in itself rather than a means toward community flourishing. The result is what philosophers call "expressive individualism"—a focus on authentic self-expression that can become disconnected from social responsibility and transcendent purpose (Bellah et al., 1985; Taylor, 1991).

Liberal societies offer unprecedented individual freedom, but this freedom often proves psychologically unbearable without the supporting structures that traditional communities provided (Rosenblatt, 1999; Schwartz, 2004). What anthropologists call concentric circles of community—extended family, neighborhood networks, religious congregations, occupational guilds—historically provided both constraints and supports that enabled human flourishing.

The mutual obligations characteristic of traditional societies create both limitations on individual self-expression and safeguards against catastrophic personal and social errors. Social norms are enforced through what sociologists call "peer accountability" based on the human need for recognition and status within meaningful communities (Coleman, 1990; Putnam, 2000).

In highly individualized societies, formal institutions—government agencies, professional services, therapeutic interventions—increasingly perform functions that communities once provided. This creates what critics call the "therapeutic state" that attempts to manage social problems through expert intervention rather than communal engagement (Furedi, 2004; Rieff, 2006). However, institutional intervention cannot replace the intimate knowledge, long-term relationships, and shared values that enable effective community care.

The drug policy debate exemplifies this dynamic. From an individual rights perspective, drug use appears to be a victimless crime involving personal choice and bodily autonomy. But from a community perspective, drug abuse reflects and reinforces social isolation, family breakdown, economic marginalization, and spiritual emptiness that affect entire networks of relationships. The person who dies from overdose was shaped by community conditions and leaves behind others who must cope with grief, trauma, and loss.

What appears to be "secular individualism" often functions as a form of Social Darwinism where the young, old, and poor are systematically disadvantaged in competition for resources, attention, and care from those in their peak productive years (Himmelfarb, 1995; Murray, 2012). The ideology of individual responsibility obscures the social conditions that enable or prevent personal flourishing.

The democratization of information through digital technologies has created new forms of community and fragmentation rather than the "global agora" that early internet enthusiasts predicted (Pariser, 2011; Sunstein, 2017). Social media platforms enable the formation of communities based on shared interests, values, and

identities that transcend geographic boundaries while often reinforcing ideological echo chambers.

Identity has become the way that individuals relate to the world in ways that are personalizable and work through predetermined choice pathways. The example of ordering coffee at Starbucks—with seemingly limitless customization options that are actually algorithmically predetermined—illustrates how contemporary consumer culture creates the illusion of individual choice while channeling behavior through corporate-controlled systems.

On political issues more complex than coffee ordering, background conditions—family socialization, educational opportunities, economic resources, geographic location, media consumption—shape individual choices in ways that are largely invisible to the choosers themselves (Bourdieu, 1986; DiMaggio & Mohr, 1985). Democratic citizenship theoretically empowers individuals to influence public policy through voting and civic engagement, but in practice, political systems favor elite interests that benefit from social fragmentation as long as it doesn't threaten capital accumulation or regime stability.

The identitarian politics of today can also be understood as the latest manifestation of the evolutionary biological phenomenon of othering: the primal distinction of us versus them. Digital technologies amplify these tendencies by making it easier to find like-minded others while avoiding challenging encounters with difference. The result is what political scientists call affective polarization"—emotional reactions to political opponents that exceed rational disagreement about policy issues (Iyengar et al., 2019; Mason, 2018).

Economic Foundations of Spiritual Crisis

One of the most significant yet underexamined aspects of contemporary global politics is the ideological challenge that Islamic economic thought poses to capitalist orthodoxy (Kuran, 2011; Rodinson, 2007). While this challenge remains politically weak and intellectually underdeveloped, it represents the only sustained critique of capitalist principles that draws on a living tradition with global reach and contemporary relevance.

The Quranic prohibition on riba (usury/interest) reflects a fundamentally different understanding of economic relationships based on risk-sharing rather than predetermined returns, partnership rather than exploitation, and community welfare rather than individual accumulation (El-Gamal, 2006; Iqbal & Molyneux, 2016). While Islamic financial institutions have developed sophisticated instruments for participating in global capitalism, many of these innovations remain controversial within traditional Islamic scholarship.

More fundamentally, Islamic economic theory prioritizes maslaha (public interest) over individual profit maximization, requiring that economic activity contribute to community flourishing rather than merely private wealth accumulation (Chapra, 2000; Kamali, 2008). This principle challenges the core assumption of neoliberal

economics that individual self-interest automatically produces collective benefit through market mechanisms.

The principle of 'adl (justice) in Islamic political economy requires that economic systems reduce rather than increase inequality, provide basic necessities for all community members, and prevent the concentration of wealth that enables political domination (Ahmad, 1980; Naqvi, 1981). Contemporary subsidies for bread, water, and dairy products in Arab countries from Saudi Arabia to Egypt reflect this ancient understanding that political legitimacy depends on ensuring basic sustenance for all citizens.

The neoliberal economic model that dominated global policy-making from the 1990s through the 2008 financial crisis has been thoroughly discredited by empirical research, yet its political and ideological influence persists (Piketty, 2014; Stiglitz, 2016). The theory that reducing taxes on the wealthy and deregulating financial markets would lift all boats through increased investment and job creation has been contradicted by decades of experience showing increased inequality, reduced social mobility, and financial instability.

The "invisible hand" metaphor from Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations has been transformed from a limited observation about market coordination into a quasi-religious doctrine about the benevolence of unfettered capitalism (Grampp, 2000; Rothschild, 2001). This theological transformation obscures Smith's actual concerns about the moral and social conditions necessary for markets to function in ways that promote general welfare rather than private accumulation.

The failure of laissez-faire approaches has led to renewed interest in what economists call "industrial policy"—government intervention to promote strategic industries, technological innovation, and economic development (Block & Keller, 2011; Mazzucato, 2013). However, this revival occurs within a context of great power competition rather than global cooperation, potentially limiting its effectiveness in addressing transnational challenges.

The deregulation and privatization of collective goods in Western nations during the late twentieth century exacerbated wealth inequalities between classes while coinciding with population diversification through immigration (Brown, 2015; Harvey, 2005). This combination created a volatile political dynamic where economic anxiety could be channeled into cultural resentment against immigrants and minorities.

The transition from manufacturing to service and knowledge economies created new forms of stratification based on education, technological skills, and social networks rather than traditional class categories (Autor, 2014; Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). Winners in the new economy increasingly come from narrow elite classes with access to prestigious educational institutions and professional networks, while traditional middle-class pathways to prosperity have been disrupted or eliminated.

This economic transformation coincided with dramatic cultural changes that activated what psychologists call the "cultural amygdala"—fear responses to rapid social change that can be exploited by populist movements (Hetherington & Weiler, 2018;

Stenner, 2005). The paralysis of democratic institutions in responding to economically marginalized constituencies created nostalgia for an idealized past when communities seemed more cohesive and opportunities more widely available.

The professional class immigration from the Global South to the United States during the 1990s and 2000s represented a "brief period of openness that seems to have now ended." The education and social class of these immigrants enabled rapid integration into American elites, but also created resentment among native-born Americans who lacked similar opportunities for economic advancement (Chua, 2018; Jiménez et al., 2018).

The "superdiversity" of contemporary America has raised fundamental questions about what values and narratives can unite multicultural societies beyond shared participation in consumer capitalism (Alba & Foner, 2015; Vertovec, 2007). The postmodern critique of American founding principles—emphasizing exploitation and exclusion rather than liberty and equality—has challenged traditional narratives without providing compelling alternatives.

For progressive critics, American history appears as "a series of injustices" where "the fight continues today, but the vision of the future is dystopian." This creates what philosophers recognize as a "nihilistic cul-de-sac" where material prosperity coexists with spiritual emptiness and existential despair (Scruton, 2014; Taylor, 2007).

The phenomenon of ennui—unfocused despair among those unable to find meaning in rapid socioeconomic change—reflects the inadequacy of purely materialist approaches to human flourishing (Svendsen, 2005; Toohey, 2011). When survival needs are met but life lacks transcendent purpose, individuals often experience what existentialist philosophers call "the absurd"—the mismatch between human need for meaning and the apparent meaninglessness of existence (Camus, 1955; Nagel, 1971).

The German response to the Greek financial crisis exemplifies how economic rationality can become divorced from moral consideration. The imposition of austerity measures rather than debt forgiveness devastated an entire generation of Greeks while German banks were protected from losses. The contrast with Germany's €130 billion COVID-19 stimulus package reveals how economic policy reflects political power rather than consistent principles.

Community, Individual, and the Crisis of Meaning

The Neolithic site of Göbekli Tepe in Turkey provides striking archaeological evidence for the role of religious community in human social development (Dietrich et al., 2012; Schmidt, 2012). Built more than 11,000 years ago—before agriculture, permanent settlements, or complex toolmaking—this elaborate temple complex required coordination among diverse groups that had no obvious economic or political reasons for cooperation.

The site suggests that religious community—shared ritual practice and symbolic meaning-making—preceded and enabled other forms of social complexity including

economic specialization, political hierarchy, and technological innovation. Rather than religion being a byproduct of material development, the archaeological evidence indicates that spiritual community may be a prerequisite for sustained human cooperation on large scales.

This insight has profound implications for contemporary debates about secularization and social cohesion. Attempts to create "secular churches" and "ethical societies" based on rational principles rather than transcendent commitments have generally failed to sustain broad participation or emotional engagement (Bruce, 2002; Heelas & Woodhead, 2005). The question is whether sustainable community requires some form of connection to purposes and realities beyond immediate self-interest.

Traditional communities function as what sociologists call "social banks" where individuals "deposit and withdraw parts of themselves throughout their lifetimes" (Coleman, 1990; Putnam, 2000). Extended families, neighborhood networks, religious congregations, and occupational guilds provide both practical support during difficulties and social recognition for contributions and achievements.

The loss of these mediating institutions has created what political scientists call "bowling alone" syndrome—the atomization of individuals who lack meaningful connections to larger purposes and communities (Putnam, 2000; Skocpol, 2003). Child-rearing and elder care become the sole responsibility of nuclear families rather than shared community obligations, creating unsustainable burdens on those in their peak productive years.

Research demonstrates that social isolation can be as damaging to physical health as smoking or obesity, while strong community connections promote longevity, mental health, and life satisfaction across all demographic categories (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010; Kawachi & Berkman, 2001). The loneliness epidemic now recognized by public health officials reflects the breakdown of social structures that historically provided meaning, support, and identity.

Mass literacy and digital communication have created what linguists call "language ecology disruption"—the rapid evolution and fragmentation of shared vocabularies and meanings (Crystal, 2004; Pennycook, 2007). English evolves at unprecedented speed with constant neologisms and the redefinition of existing words by specialized communities. Social media subcultures develop coded vocabularies that are incomprehensible to outsiders.

This linguistic fragmentation reflects and reinforces the broader fragmentation of moral and intellectual authority. Traditional gatekeepers—religious leaders, educational institutions, professional organizations, media outlets—have lost their capacity to establish shared standards for truth, meaning, and value (Bennett & Livingston, 2018). In the absence of trusted authorities, individuals increasingly rely on algorithmic curation and peer networks that reinforce existing beliefs rather than challenging them.

The result is what philosophers call "epistemic fragmentation"—the breakdown of shared criteria for evaluating truth claims and moral arguments (MacIntyre, 1984; Stout, 2004). Different communities operate with incommensurable frameworks for understanding reality, making productive dialogue and democratic deliberation increasingly difficult.

In materialist societies, a person's ability to create and maintain wealth is the sole measure of success, eliminating alternative sources of dignity and recognition available in traditional societies. Religious scholarship, artistic mastery, moral exemplarity, community service, and spiritual insight—all historically valued forms of achievement—become marginalized or commodified within market logics.

The "conflation of a fulfilling social life with material wealth means that there will always be a scarcity of materials, widening the gap between wants and needs and creating pervasive dissatisfaction among those relatively less well-off." This dynamic produces what sociologists call "relative deprivation"—the sense of injustice that comes from comparing one's situation to others rather than evaluating it in absolute terms (Gurr, 1970; Runciman, 1966).

The weariness and discontent characteristic of much of the contemporary West reflect not absolute poverty but a mismatch between what is expected by virtue of being born in the West and the reality of competition at global scale in which others are proving to be doing just as well or even better. This challenges assumptions about Western superiority and progress that have been central to modern identity formation.

The rise of "digital natives" who have grown up with social media rather than traditional religious community represents a fundamental shift in how identity is formed and maintained (Prensky, 2001; Twenge, 2017). Liking religion on social media platforms transforms the symbols of religion into an identitarian brand, replacing the difficult self-work of embodying and striving toward the seven virtues (prudence, temperance, fortitude, justice, faith, hope, and love) that long held Christian societies in communion.

Traditional religious formation required sustained practice, community accountability, and gradual character development over time. Digital religion, by contrast, offers immediate access to symbolic resources without corresponding demands for personal transformation or community commitment. The result is what religious studies scholars call "spiritual materialism"—the use of religious symbols and practices for ego enhancement rather than ego transcendence (Carrette & King, 2005; Trungpa, 2002).

This dynamic helps explain phenomena like the prosperity gospel, New Age spirituality, and therapeutic Christianity that promise personal benefits without corresponding obligations to community welfare or social justice. Religion becomes another consumer choice rather than a transformative way of life that challenges individualistic assumptions and materialistic values.

International Relations and the Psychology of Nations

Traditional international relations theory assumes that states behave as rational actors pursuing measurable interests through strategic calculation (Waltz, 1979). This approach has proven inadequate for understanding contemporary global politics, where emotion, identity, honor, and dignity often override material considerations in shaping state behavior.

The concept of dignity in international relations—the need for recognition and respect—frequently proves more important than economic or security interests in explaining conflict and cooperation (Lindemann & Ringmar, 2012; Wolf, 2011). Leaders of smaller nations often feel constantly being lectured to by larger powers, creating resentment that can override practical considerations in policy-making.

Middle powers face particular challenges in navigating between leadership aspirations and structural constraints. India exemplifies this dynamic: leading the Non-Aligned Movement while being unable to harness its dormant natural and human capital to achieve its nationalistic aim of becoming a superpower. Indian diplomats have used positional advantages to maximize their influence through shrewd maneuvering between superpowers, but this strategy has limitations when fundamental interests conflict.

The personification of institutions through terms like "Washington," "Beijing," or "Brussels" obscures the complex human dynamics that actually drive policy decisions (Hudson, 2005; Jervis, 2017). Just as individuals can experience trauma that shapes future behavior, nations and peoples carry collective wounds that influence responses to contemporary challenges in ways that appear irrational to outside observers.

Primacy politics—the pursuit of national self-interest as the only guiding principle in international relations—often reflects attempts at psychological recovery from historical trauma or humiliation. War becomes one way of trying to reassert agency in the world when diplomatic and economic measures fail to provide needed recognition and respect.

The Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh illustrates how psychological rather than rational factors explain the simmering conflict that ended in disaster for Armenia. Both sides instrumentalized religion and historical memory to legitimize territorial claims and mobilize popular support, leading to destruction that served neither side's material interests.

Western media often describe speeches by leaders from developing nations as rambling when they differ from "the typically time-limited and efficient orations given by most Western leaders. This criticism reflects cultural bias rather than objective evaluation, as these "so-called rambling speeches convey respect and dignity for their listeners" by acknowledging their intelligence, concerns, and cultural values.

The psychological dynamic of political communication means that people vote against their financial interests when they receive the intangible benefit of being seen and heard. Leadership effectiveness depends on understanding and responding to the psychological persona of populations rather than simply delivering policy information or rational arguments.

Islamic political wisdom holds that the leader is only as worthy as and is a reflection of its people. This principle emphasizes the reciprocal relationship between leadership and population, suggesting that effective governance requires deep understanding of collective psychology, cultural values, and spiritual needs rather than merely technical competence or strategic acumen.

"The idea of dignity as a form of equality is critical to understanding a non-Western conception of human flourishing." Many societies outside the West organize political life around concepts of honor, respect, and recognition that cannot be reduced to

material interests or individual rights (Honneth, 1992; Margalit, 1996). In Islamic political thought, human flourishing (falah) involves submission of the self (read: ego) to the Divine will combined with public and private promotion of good character as pathways toward just society.

This understanding challenges Western assumptions that political legitimacy derives primarily from economic performance or procedural democracy. Many societies prioritize what political scientists call "substantive legitimacy"—the capacity of governments to promote moral development, social harmony, and spiritual flourishing rather than merely protecting individual rights or maximizing economic growth (Bell, 2015; Li, 2020).

The failure of Western-imposed institutions in Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, and other contexts partly reflects misunderstanding of these alternative conceptions of political authority and social order. Effective governance in many cultures requires what anthropologists call "thick legitimacy"—deep integration with local values, religious traditions, and social structures rather than formal compliance with universal democratic procedures (Geertz, 1980; Scott, 1998).

A Psychological and Spiritual Crisis

The polycrisis can be understood fundamentally as a psychological crisis, in which an overwhelming paralysis caused by a lack of certainty has led to feelings of ennui and apathy. This paralysis particularly affects the upper middle classes in the West because of a lack of purpose and of striving and because the pursuit of mammon has replaced the ancient search for spiritual gnosis and ultimately the impossible: apotheosis.

Modern secular societies have eliminated traditional sources of meaning—cosmic purpose, eternal significance, transcendent community—without providing adequate substitutes (Berger, 1967; Taylor, 2007). The result is what existentialist philosophers recognize as "existential anxiety"—the dread that comes from confronting the apparent meaninglessness of existence without spiritual resources for coping with that confrontation (Kierkegaard, 1843; Tillich, 1952).

Individual, small group, and national psychology shape how emotion shapes leaders and institutions as they navigate future change. Humans are instinctually hardwired to fear the unknown other as a survival mechanism, but dense population concentrations and urbanization have required us to overcome this hardwiring and create new identity structures to facilitate the cooperation needed for flourishing."

Collective Trauma and Social Pathology

What becomes of the other, and how do we recognize our own pathologies as a society? Trauma—both individual and collective—tends to be hidden and embedded

within both actions and discourse that are played out in the policies and lives of the other. The prevalence of genocides, ethnic cleansing, and systematic oppression since the nineteenth century reflects the failures of a unitary nation-state ideology" that "tends to preclude pluralism and can direct excesses of the society toward the other in the forms of anger and capital exploitation.

Historical trauma affects entire societies in ways that may not be immediately visible but influence policy decisions, cultural attitudes, and political possibilities across generations (Alexander, 2012; Hirschberger, 2018). Examples include: the Russian fear of encirclement stemming from repeated invasions; Chinese sensitivity about territorial integrity reflecting the "century of humiliation"; American oscillation between isolationism and interventionism rooted in contradictory founding experiences; European attitudes toward immigration shaped by memories of both colonialism and victimization.

Understanding these psychological dynamics is essential for effective diplomacy and conflict resolution. Technical solutions that ignore emotional and spiritual dimensions of political grievances often fail because they address symptoms rather than underlying causes of conflict and mistrust.

To avoid those excesses, the individual and society needs to achieve transcendence. How does one go beyond the self to enable an internal critique of past actions (introspection) but also transcend the historical moment and so envision a better world? This question points to the necessity of what religious traditions call spiritual transformation—fundamental changes in consciousness that enable new ways of seeing and relating to others.

The Axial Age (eighth to third centuries BCE) provides historical precedent for such transformation. During this period, "remarkably similar, revolutionary ways of thinking emerged independently across the world" in China, India, Iran, Israel, and Greece (Jaspers, 1953; Armstrong, 2006). Figures like Confucius, Buddha, Zoroaster, the Hebrew prophets, and Socrates introduced radically new philosophical and religious ideas, shifting human consciousness from localized, mythical beliefs toward more universal and transcendent concepts.

Contemporary global challenges may be creating conditions for a new axial transformation that integrates insights from multiple wisdom traditions while addressing distinctly modern problems. Just as we today compete to produce goods and services, human society's efforts at innovation and exploration could be focused on spiritual development, possibly transforming our relationships among ourselves and with the planet.

The first spiritual challenge that all humanity faces is the way we see the world." Max Weber's concept of "disenchantment" describes how modern rationalization has eliminated spiritual dimensions from public discourse and policy-making (Schroeder, 1992; Weber, 1946). From the perspective of policymakers around the globe, the world is disenchanted in a Weberian sense. Even those politicians who invoke religion do so mainly as symbolic rhetoric to appeal to the populace.

This disenchantment creates practical as well as spiritual problems. But how would we act in terms of character and virtue if we believed God was real? Many indigenous and traditional societies maintain what anthropologists call enchanted

worldviews where the Asian spiritual world is animate with the spirits of angels, jinn, and deities all jockeying for power and influence over the material reality of the human being.

Contemporary interest in environmentalism, consciousness studies, and psychedelic research reflects attempts to "re-enchant" modern life through secular means (Bennett, 2001; Partridge, 2004). If all the material world is animate, how would that change how we relate to and exploit it? This question has immediate relevance for addressing climate change, biodiversity loss, and other environmental challenges that require fundamental changes in human-nature relationships.

The Islamic and Jain traditions provide unique insights into how we see and understand the natural world." Islamic concepts of tawhid (unity), khilafah (stewardship), and mizan (balance) offer frameworks for understanding human responsibility within creation (Foltz et al., 2003; Nasr, 1996). Believing that God is omnipresent, Muslims are commanded to act as if he is. This awareness is cultivated daily through prayers, supplications, and remembrances with the tasbih (Muslim rosary).

Jain concepts of ahimsa (non-violence) and jiva (consciousness in all beings) provide even more radical challenges to anthropocentric worldviews (Chapple, 2002; Dundas, 2002). Jainism recognizes consciousness not only in obviously sentient beings but in plants, minerals, and elemental forces, requiring extraordinary care in all interactions with the natural world.

"Panpsychism is the secular corollary to the ancient Indic, such as Jain, ideas of a consciously animate world." Contemporary philosophers and scientists are rediscovering these insights through consciousness studies, quantum physics, and complexity theory (Chalmers, 1996; Goff, 2017). The implications for environmental ethics, economic policy, and international cooperation could be profound if such perspectives gained wider acceptance.

A humility in understanding the functioning of the world either as directed by or consciously unrelated to God helps policymakers come to understand that the world's problems require a global collaborative response. This humility recognizes that the self as decision maker cannot solve the issue nor understand all the ordered effects of decisions made today, in the same way that we are living with the consequences of past decisions.

Such humility does not negate human agency but acknowledges the limits of human knowledge and control. This does not negate human free will but acknowledges the Divine potential for knowing all possible outcomes and allowing humanity to choose its own path as well as the consequences. Religious traditions offer resources for maintaining hope and commitment in the face of uncertainty that purely secular approaches often lack.

It is ultimately the future as unknown that allows both for hope and despair. Religions add something more than a secular understanding of history allows. While political analysis depends on previous actions as predictors for the future, religious perspectives make space for what Nassim Taleb calls "black swan events"—unexpected developments that fundamentally alter existing possibilities (Taleb, 2007).

Climate Change and Demographic Crisis

Climate change represents perhaps the greatest collective action challenge in human history, requiring unprecedented cooperation across national, cultural, and religious boundaries (Gardiner, 2011; Jamieson, 2014). Climate change is the hinge on which the polycrisis rests. Envisioning the death of the planet and the extinction of humanity is so debilitating that we choose not to confront these possibilities.

The psychological dimensions of climate change—what researchers now call "climate anxiety," "eco-grief," and "solastalgia"—reflect the inadequacy of purely technical approaches to environmental challenges (Clayton, 2020; Cunsolo & Ellis, 2017). Indeed, there exists within global economic and political leadership what Freud described as thanatos, the death drive, which would hasten our end.

Addressing climate change requires what theologians call "conversion of heart"—fundamental transformation in how humans understand their relationship to nature, each other, and future generations (Berry, 1988; White, 1967). Climate change is epochal in character and generational in effect, requiring a type of collective action that perhaps has not been seen by humanity since the building of the great Neolithic solstice temples.

Global demographic decline is perhaps as damaging as climate change, and the two are certainly connected. Developed countries face unprecedented population aging while developing countries continue experiencing population growth, creating migration pressures and cultural anxieties that destabilize political systems (Coleman, 2006; Goldstone, 2010).

From Taiwan, with a reproduction rate of 1.09, and continuing westward, the populations of developed nations are decreasing at an alarming rate. This decline reflects both environmental factors—endocrine-disrupting phthalates and other industrial chemicals that affect fertility—and cultural factors—the success of individualism over communitarianism, which privileges self-realization over family formation and community continuity.

Significantly, "the only groups and communities where fertility rates are at or above replacement levels are those in religious communities," suggesting that spiritual commitment may be necessary for sustainable human reproduction (Goldscheider, 2006; Kaufmann, 2010). There may be an important connection between multiple secular forces that impede fertility are countered through a religious worldview.

If this existential threat cannot be resolved by collective action and if secular appeals to people's humanity also fail to bring about cooperation and change at a global level, then what strategies can be used to enable action toward the common goal of species survival? Religious communities may be uniquely positioned to address climate change because they possess both global reach and spiritual resources necessary for sustaining long-term commitment in the face of uncertainty and sacrifice.

The only institutions to fully see and process climate change's impact are those of the ancient world religions, which span the globe, stitching together the

tribes of humanity into a global community of believers with shared community through rituals and practice. Religious traditions offer frameworks for understanding suffering, hope, and transcendence that can motivate environmental action even when technical solutions seem inadequate or politically impossible.

However, secular alternatives like "planetary ethics" face significant limitations. While thinkers like Whitney Bauman call for embracing "uncertainty, celebrate diversity, and recognize our profound entanglement with all 'earth others,'" such approaches are "unlikely to overcome the deep-seated biases and violence that separate people" without the institutional support and transcendent orientation that traditional religions provide (Bauman, 2014).

Toward Covenantal Pluralism

> From the perspective of most political economists, the emerging world order is being shaped by the China-US competition of autocracy versus democracy within competing capitalisms. From a sociological perspective, the challenge is liberal individualism versus traditional communitarianism. Covenantal pluralism offers a third alternative that "aligns the rights and responsibilities of society and those of the individual within a framework of spirituality.

This approach recognizes that the elimination of the metaphysical from public discourse, political and economic analysis, and public policy has led to the inevitable failure of institutions to recognize that achieving the common good, or human flourishing, requires more than having one's material needs met. Both the upper middle-class ennui and the disproportionate mortality and despair of the working class are caused by the absence of higher aspirations for life and nourishing of the spirit.

The spiritual poverty of contemporary life manifests in extreme ways like the American phenomenon of school shootings and more subtle forms of alienation and despair. For all its flaws, religion provided community and a sense of continuity of being with the past and the future through the present. The self was a stitch in a patchwork quilt of the community—a spiritual being who has the ability to achieve transcendence, which gives meaning to the suffering that inevitably is part of the human condition.

Modern societies face what public health officials now recognize as a "loneliness epidemic" with consequences "so consequential that it can reduce longevity as much as heart disease" (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2015; Murthy, 2020). This reflects the breakdown of traditional community structures that provided both practical support and existential meaning throughout the life cycle.

For the young, no longer does a village—made up of the extended family, friends, and neighbors—raise the child but just one or two caregivers. The numerous aunties and uncles in traditional societies made childrearing much less burdensome on the parents. Research confirms that single-parent households suffer not only economic impoverishment but also developmental disadvantages for children and mental health consequences for parents.

Old age can be an isolating and depressing time of life, especially as loved ones and acquaintances die. Both groups benefit from a diversity of relationships across generations: the young person from an elder's wisdom and an older individual from the perspective and energy of children. The segregation of age groups in modern societies impoverishes all generations by eliminating opportunities for mutual learning and support.

If we take away its rituals and beliefs, religion is ultimately about community. It is about creating narratives of being and identity that can bring people of different walks of life together within a common language and practice to support and nurture them. Effective religious communities provide both transcendent orientation and practical support that enable human flourishing across the entire life cycle.

Because having faith in an abstract deity is difficult even for the most devout monotheist, stories are used to create the metaphors to describe one's emotional states. Religious narratives—the jataka tales of the Buddha's early life or biblical parables in Christian cultures—provide shared vocabularies for discussing universal human experiences of suffering, hope, love, loss, and meaning.

The challenge facing pluralistic societies is, How do we integrate individual stories within a collective and how do we integrate community narratives into a master national narrative that respects diversity but is not reductionist? This integration requires what this book calls covenantal pluralism—approaches that honor both diversity and unity through shared commitment to each other's flourishing.

Social cohesion and harmony very much depend on how narratives of being and belonging are reconciled in a dynamic way that allows for positive change and development. This process becomes more complex in digital age where anyone engaged in interfaith work knows this is a very hard job. It is a continuous process of relationship building and tending, generation by generation.

The political shortcut is a singular national ideology to which all are expected to conform. Yet, this ends up being brittle, needing more and more centripetal force to maintain the narrative fiction of uniformity. The centrifugal forces of diversity threaten to dissolve the body politic into ever smaller identitarian groups. Democratic societies must find alternatives that neither impose uniformity nor fragment into incompatible tribes.

The challenge is finding unity in a society characterized by diversity. It is here that covenantal pluralism can play a positive role: it can foster diversity through finding commonalities that can transcend the material present and direct the society and the individual to attain higher goals of human flourishing that incorporate the metaphysical in addition to the physical.

Covenantal pluralism seeks to anchor individuals in community and understands rights as mutually reinforcing relationships. Rather than viewing rights as individual possessions to be defended against others, this approach recognizes that genuine freedom requires community support and that community flourishing depends on protecting individual dignity and agency.

Perhaps past iterations of pluralism can be a guide for our digital future. Historical examples of successful religious pluralism—from medieval Córdoba to Mughal India to contemporary Indonesia—demonstrate that diverse communities

can coexist peacefully when they share commitments to justice, mutual recognition, and transcendent purposes that unite them across their differences.

Conclusion: The Necessity of Spiritual Transformation

The polycrisis we face today cannot be addressed through purely technical, political, or economic solutions. Climate change, demographic transition, technological disruption, economic inequality, and political polarization are interconnected challenges that require what religious traditions call conversion of heart—fundamental transformation in how humans understand themselves, their relationships with each other, and their place in the cosmos.

Covenantal pluralism offers a framework for such transformation that honors both the reality of deep differences between communities and the necessity of cooperation for survival and flourishing. This approach differs from liberal tolerance by acknowledging that sustainable cooperation requires shared commitment to each other's welfare. It differs from multicultural celebration by recognizing that not all cultural practices are equally valuable and that difficult conversations about truth, justice, and human dignity cannot be avoided indefinitely.

The Indonesian case study examined in later chapters demonstrates that covenantal pluralism is possible even in highly diverse societies, but requires specific conditions: national ideology supporting diversity, consistent government commitment, economic growth providing material foundation for hope, civil society organizations building relationships across group boundaries, and spiritual traditions that orient communities toward transcendent purposes beyond tribal self-interest.

The question facing all societies is whether these conditions can be created or maintained in an era of climate change, technological disruption, economic inequality, and great power competition. The answer may well determine whether the twenty-first century brings greater cooperation across human differences or increased conflict that threatens the foundations of civilized life.

The stakes could not be higher. In a world of weapons of mass destruction, global environmental crisis, and instant communication, we literally cannot afford the luxury of religious hatred and civilizational conflict. We must learn to live together across our differences—not by eliminating those differences, but by finding ways to make them sources of mutual enrichment rather than mutual destruction. The following chapters examine how covenantal pluralism might contribute to this essential task.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

Chapter 3
Religion

Introduction: The Great Divergence of Worldviews

The emergence and development of secularism—the institutional separation of religious and political authority—has created one of the most profound cultural divides in human history. This separation has enabled Western societies to diverge so dramatically from the rest of the world that scholars now employ terms like "majority world" to distinguish between Western social norms and the broader global convergence found among African and Asian societies (Oppong & Dombroski, 2024; Norris & Inglehart, 2004). The West's social and political preferences have become outliers not only in terms of contemporary international norms but also when viewed through the lens of historical human experience (Eisenstadt, 2000; Huntington, 1996).

Consider the legalization of same-sex marriage as a case study in this divergence. While Western progressive movements champion marriage equality as a fundamental human right, traditional societies across the globe—rooted in millennia-old religious and cultural frameworks—continue to view such arrangements as incompatible with their understanding of family, society, and divine order (Kollman, 2017; Rahman, 2014). The statistics are telling: as of 2025, only 3 countries have legalized same-sex marriage, while the remaining 155 countries—representing approximately 0% of the world's nations—have not (ILGA, 2023). This stark division illustrates how Western liberalism has become increasingly isolated from global majority opinion on fundamental questions of social organization (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005).

The trajectory that led to this great divergence spans more than two and a half millennia, from the Ancient Greek polis to the modern nation-state. This evolution was characterized by the gradual distillation and eventual sacralization of the idea that the individual—rather than the community, family, or divine order—represents the fundamental unit of moral and political consideration (Dumont, 1986; Taylor, 1994). While natural rights traditions exist across cultures, the perspective that became dominant in the West focused specifically on the individual as a corporeal entity

© The Author(s) 2026

I. Akhtar, *Covenantal Pluralism*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-31479-6_3

whose material needs and desires became the primary concern of social organization (Macpherson, 1962).

The rise of capitalism further entrenched this individualistic worldview by transforming persons into state assets for economic development and nation-building (Polanyi, 1944; Weber, 1905/2002). The Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, which ended the devastating wars of religion that had torn Europe apart, established the trajectory toward secularism that would eventually spread across European societies and the territories they later colonized (Nexon, 2009; Philpott, 2001). This momentous shift marked not just a political arrangement but a fundamental reimagining of the relationship between the sacred and the secular, the individual and the community, the temporal and the eternal.

The Theology of Individualism: From Reformation to Revolution

The wars of religion that preceded Westphalia were fundamentally rooted in a conception of religion as belief—a set of intellectual propositions to be accepted or rejected—rather than as a comprehensive community of practice that encompassed all aspects of life (Bruce, 2003; Hurd, 2008). This intellectual framing of religious difference made it possible for religion to be gradually extracted from the daily lives of people as they experienced the dramatic upheaval and urban displacement caused by modernity's technological and social revolutions (Berger, 1967; Wilson, 1982).

Embedded within the Protestant Reformation was a radical individualization of society that would eventually find its full expression in the ethic of capitalism (Tawney, 1926; Weber, 1905/2002). The Reformation's emphasis on personal faith, individual conscience, and direct relationship with the divine—bypassing traditional communal and hierarchical structures—laid the groundwork for a worldview in which society's desires and needs came to be understood as merely an aggregate of individual needs and desires (Troeltsch, 1912/1992). This perspective found its philosophical culmination in utilitarian thought, which reduced complex questions of human flourishing to calculations of individual pleasure and pain (Bentham, 1789/1996; Mill, 1863/1998).

From this Western perspective, human flourishing became fundamentally about how one lives one's own best life—a project of individual self-actualization rather than an expression of social harmony or cosmic order (Bellah et al., 1985; Taylor, 1994). This represents a dramatic departure from traditional societies, where individual fulfillment was understood to emerge naturally from one's proper place within a larger web of relationships, obligations, and purposes that extended beyond the immediate self (Durkheim, 1893/1997; Tönnies, 17/2001).

The implications of this shift extend far beyond academic philosophy into the most practical questions of political organization. Every political system must grapple

with a fundamental question: What constitutes society's primary building block—the autonomous individual or the interconnected family? Western democracies have increasingly privileged the individual's needs and desires as the ultimate form of self-expression, enshrining this preference in legal frameworks that often view family, community, and traditional obligations as potential constraints on personal freedom (Glendon, 1991; Sandel, 1996).

In contrast, many democracies in the developing world operate according to different assumptions about human nature and social organization. In these contexts, voting patterns are typically determined less by individual conviction—the Western democratic ideal—than by group solidarity, family loyalty, and communal obligations (Norris, 2004; Diamond, 1999). Neither system is without its flaws and limitations. Extreme libertarianism, which approaches the autarkic ideal of complete individual self-sufficiency, tends to lead to the destabilization of societal institutions that depend on mutual obligation and shared sacrifice (Nozick, 1974; Hayek, 1944). Conversely, the extremes of communalism can result in the subservience of individual dignity to the tyranny of communal norms and the oppressive power of collective judgment (Berlin, 1958; Mill, 1859/1998).

Ancient Wisdom and Enduring Structures

The social structures developed in Indic and Sinic civilizations, grounded in household relationships and concepts such as parent–child filial piety, have demonstrated remarkable stability across millennia of historical change (Tu, 1985; Sharma, 2003). Confucianism provides perhaps the most articulated expression of this form of communitarianism through its framework of five fundamental relationships: ruler-subject, father-son, older-younger, husband-wife, and friend-friend (Ames & Rosemont, 1998; Fingarette, 1972). These relationships are governed by ten essential virtues: benevolence-loyalty, love-filial piety, kindness-deference, righteousness-submissiveness, and reciprocal fidelity. This systematic approach to human relationships creates a stable foundation for social order that transcends the preferences of any particular individual (Bell, 2008; Angle, 2009).

Hinduism similarly systematizes these communal obligations across the entirety of one's lifetime through its concept of four āśrama or life stages: the idealized progression from student to householder to retirement to renunciation (Olivelle, 1993; Flood, 1996). Each stage carries specific duties, relationships, and spiritual purposes that connect the individual to larger cosmic and social orders. This framework provides meaning and direction that extends far beyond personal preference or individual choice (Heesterman, 1985; Knott, 1998).

Despite major transformations in world orders over the past five millennia—from the rise and fall of empires to the global realignment that created the modern West—the family has endured as the fundamental basis of political stability across the Eurasian plateau, from the nomadic steppes to contemporary urban centers (Anderson, 1991; Goody, 2000). While the specific forms and functions

of family have been contested and evolved, its centrality to human organization has remained constant. The communal nature of most African and Asian societies naturally led to their historical preference for socialist forms of political organization, which can be understood as modern, secularized expressions of traditional political communitarianism (Nyerere, 1968; Sen, 1999).

This preference for collective over individual approaches to social organization helps explain why many postcolonial societies have struggled with Western-style liberal democracy, which assumes individual autonomy as the foundation of political legitimacy (Diamond, 2008; Zakaria, 1997). The tension between these different anthropological assumptions continues to shape global politics and international relations in profound ways (Katzenstein, 1996; Keohane & Nye, 2011).

Colonial Encounters and the Question of Secularism

The colonial period marked the first large-scale modern encounter between Muslim societies and secularism as a coherent political ideology (Asad, 2003; Brown, 2000). British colonization, with its characteristic pragmatic approach, emphasized the distinction between public and private spheres, treating religion as a matter of personal law and bureaucratic administration while reserving government and civil administration for secular authority (Cohn, 1996; Metcalf, 1994). This separation allowed colonial administrators to avoid direct confrontation with religious authorities while maintaining ultimate political control.

French colonization pursued a more ambitious and transformative agenda, aiming for the fundamental rewriting of individual identity as publicly secular—which in practice often meant aggressively anti-Muslim policies designed to transform colonial subjects into Frenchmen through the revolutionary values of liberté, égalité, and fraternité (Conklin, 1997; Scott, 2007). This assimilationist approach sought to replace existing cultural and religious identities with a new, supposedly universal French identity rooted in Enlightenment values.

Interestingly, the Mughal and Ottoman empires that had ruled over religiously, linguistically, and ethnically diverse populations for centuries had developed sophisticated civil codes that remained largely indifferent to identity markers in matters of public law (Inalcik, 1973; Richards, 1993). These pre-colonial systems often demonstrated greater practical tolerance for diversity than the supposedly enlightened colonial regimes that replaced them (Chatterjee, 1993; Pandey, 1990).

The eventual overthrow of colonial rule represented the culmination of decades of resistance by religious establishments across the colonized world (Said, 1978; Spivak, 1988). Much of the anti-Western sentiment that characterizes contemporary developing world politics can be traced to the colonial experience, during which indigenous peoples lost not only their political power and economic autonomy but also their cultural dignity and sense of historical agency (Fanon, 1961/2004; Memmi, 1965). The psychological wounds inflicted by this period of subordination continue to

shape political movements and cultural assertions across the Global South (Bhabha, 1994; Nandy, 1983).

Postcolonial political Islamists defined their project in explicit opposition to secularism, reimagining Islam as a comprehensive system that linked mosque and state in an indissoluble unity (Maududi, 1960; Qutb, 1964/2000). Yet historical evidence suggests that forms of political secularism actually existed within medieval Islamic civilization, where religious authority and political power often operated according to different logics and institutional arrangements (Bulliet, 1994; Hodgson, 1974). The contemporary claim that everything within Muslim history was inherently "Islamic" represents an anachronistic reading that serves particular political purposes rather than historical accuracy (Ahmed, 1992; Asad, 1993).

Religion functioned as a cultural thread that ran through civilization, embedded in daily practices and worldviews, helping to define meaning and purpose without necessarily serving as the direct causal force behind all political and social developments. This represents one of the major misreadings of contemporary political Islamism: the assumption that because religious language and symbols appear prominently in rhetoric and action, the movement is primarily motivated by religious concerns. In reality, the fundamental drivers of human political action remain what they have always been throughout history: the complex interplay of love and hatred, the pursuit of power and the management of fear.

Varieties of Secular Experience

The secularism developed within colonial powers reflected different national approaches to the relationship between religion and state. Anglophone secularism generally aimed at protecting religion from state interference, while French laïcité focused on protecting the state from religious influence (Kuru, 2009; Laborde, 2017). These distinct models have been adapted by non-Western powers according to their particular historical circumstances and cultural contexts (Bhargava, 1998; Stepan, 2000).

Turkey's implementation of laiklik under Ataturk in the early twentieth century provides a fascinating case study (Mardin, 1998; Yavuz, 2003). This aggressive secularization program represented a reaction to the perception that Ottoman excesses of wealth and power, combined with traditional Islamic practices, had become impediments to modernization and national development. Turkish laiklik internalized Western colonial critiques of the Islamic world's supposed underdevelopment compared to European colonial powers, attempting to catch up through cultural transformation (Ahmad, 1993; Zürcher, 2004).

However, the rise of the AK Party and Erdoğan's substantial support in the Anatolian heartland have fundamentally changed Turkish definitions of secularism to include an explicitly Islamist agenda (Öniş, 2013; White, 2013). This transformation demonstrates how political Islam can both threaten existing state-religion

relationships and thrive by using state institutions to advance religious goals through ostensibly secular civic institutions (Nasr, 2005; Roy, 2007).

The experience of secularism in Muslim-majority societies over recent decades reveals several important patterns that challenge conventional Western assumptions about modernization and religious decline (Bruce, 2002; Norris & Inglehart, 2004). First, increasing levels of wealth and the mitigation of existential risks by modern states, coupled with the ubiquity of mobile social media and global communication, have indeed led to a secularization of younger generations in many contexts (Inglehart, 1997; Heelas & Woodhead, 2005). However, while the number of Muslims continues to increase worldwide, this demographic growth has not necessarily translated into a discernible increase in traditional religious practice or the development of spiritual knowledge that emerges from deep engagement with mystical traditions (Cesari, 2004; Pew Research Center, 2017). Instead, religion has increasingly become commodified, developed into a lifestyle preference and identity brand rather than a comprehensive way of life (Hoover & Echchaibi, 2014; Lynch, 2007).

Second, the political imposition of religion and the oppressive nature of Muslim militant extremism have led not only to secularization but also to outright atheism among growing numbers of educated urban youth across West Asian societies. This phenomenon is particularly evident in Saudi Arabia and Iran, where religious observance is mandated and enforced by state power, primarily through the regulation of women's bodies and behavior in public spaces. The horrific experience of ISIS's occupation of Syria and Iraq has further dampened Islamist aspirations for the restoration of a global caliphate, as the attempted revival of a Late Antique political form in the modern world proved too extreme even for the vast majority of the world's Muslims.

Third, countering this secular-atheist trend is the increasing religiosity of middle classes in countries where Islam was historically suppressed or where Muslims constitute minority populations. From the former Soviet Turkic nation-states of Central Asia to Muslim diaspora communities in Europe and the United States, Muslims are increasingly asserting public Muslim identities, whether through wearing hijab, demanding shariah-compliant financial products, or establishing Islamic educational institutions.

Islam at its historical best has been profoundly multivocal, allowing multiple voices in interpretation and encouraging vernacular expressions that reflect local cultures and circumstances. The end of the Ottoman caliphate in 1924 effectively ended centralized religious authority in the Sunni majority world, while Twelver Shia communities maintained their ayatollah system, which remained insulated from direct state control through independent sources of funding and religious taxation. Even among Shia religious leaders, authority was understood as first among equals rather than the divine right claimed by the Catholic Pope.

The deregulation of religious authority by modern states has paradoxically led to religion's flourishing in new forms, while the challenges of Muslim minority integration in Western societies have given rise to remarkable cultural innovations that express both the contestation and redefinition of Islamic tradition. The development of contemporary Muslim artistic cultures reveals the dynamism of multiple Muslim

modernities, providing both individual self-actualization through faith and group identity and solidarity that help maintain social stability despite predictions of youth radicalization.

The Structure of Sacred Community

Religious traditions have historically served crucial functions in managing the individual energies that emerge from biological development and psychological pathologies. When these energies are released without proper channeling, they can prove chaotic to existing social orders and relationships. Religious cultures create essential frameworks for community formation through lifecycle events—birth, marriage, death—and daily devotional practices that connect individuals to larger purposes and meanings.

There is something both profoundly comforting and socially necessary about the structure and even rigidity of orthodox religious practice. This appeal to order and hierarchy echoes in political tendencies during times of stress toward authoritarian solutions that promise clear answers and stable identities. The psychological comfort provided by religious structure helps explain its persistent appeal even in ostensibly secular societies.

The challenge of understanding life as fundamentally characterized by suffering—a perspective deeply rooted in Indic religious traditions—motivates individuals to strive for something better in this life or in future rebirths. The ultimate purpose (telos) of human existence becomes the achievement of a comfortable corporeal existence defined by virtue ethics, ultimately enabling salvation or liberation in an afterlife or through the cessation of rebirth. From Christianity to Pure Land Buddhism, the concept of soul continuity provides an eternal reservoir of hope and direction that can be accessed during even the most dire tragedies and existential crises.

The combination of ultimate purpose, ritualized practices, and community belonging helps define religious traditions and bind their adherents together across time and geographical space, providing a foundation for identity that transcends immediate circumstances. The persistent tension between individual rights and community needs finds resolution in religious frameworks through multiple relationships with divine reality. Prayer, communion, fellowship, and service represent various ways through which finite human beings can experience and understand infinite reality.

The Crisis of Enlightenment Rationalism

If the Enlightenment represented a decisive turn toward reason and away from what it characterized as superstition, then secularism represents its political culmination—the attempt to ensure that rational considerations dominate politics while eliminating

or at least relegating the supposedly irrational (emotional, spiritual, traditional) to private spheres. The fundamental problem with this modernist project, from a philosophical perspective, is the nihilism that has emerged as the logical byproduct of abandoning transcendent meaning and purpose.

When the purpose of a good life comes to center exclusively on corporeal existence—negating or remaining agnostic about metaphysical reality and afterlife possibilities—human meaning becomes truncated and ultimately unsatisfying. The classical understanding of human beings as composed of body, mind, and spirit recognized the necessity of integrating all three dimensions. The Enlightenment's attempt to separate mind from the other two, allowing rational calculation to dominate emotional and spiritual life, has proven psychologically and socially unsustainable.

The endless questioning that pure rationalism encourages—asking "why" about every aspect of existence until reaching fundamental absurdity—ultimately leads to despair and meaninglessness. Because death represents the final negation of all human projects and achievements, the pleasures and accomplishments of temporal life prove insufficient to replace transcendental meaning and purpose that religious traditions have historically provided.

The Enlightenment's ideal of reason as the sufficient basis for ordering society has come under tremendous stress during the contemporary polycrisis, revealing both the limitations of pure rationalism and the fragility of democratic institutions that depend on rational discourse and shared commitment to evidence-based decision-making. The West appears to have lost much of its energy and sense of historical purpose as it achieved unprecedented material success but struggled to articulate compelling visions of human flourishing that transcend consumption and individual preference.

The creativity and innovation currently emerging from Asian societies in their confrontation with Western hegemony represents the unleashing of a religious fervor that expresses itself through civilizational and nationalistic language while drawing on deep spiritual and cultural resources. The American response and ability to continue leading the Western world depends heavily on immigration of global talent and the drive to maintain geopolitical hegemony. But beyond maintaining power, what larger purpose guides Western global politics? The political polarization afflicting Western democracies can be understood as a symptom of existential despair that contributes to the breakdown of both national and international institutions.

The Enlightenment's objective of creating perfectly ordered and rational societies was always undermined by the persistence of the irrational—the irreducible human tendency to exceed the boundaries of any systematic attempt at control. People have never remained within their assigned social roles or behaved according to rational expectations; there has always been the outlier, the exception, the creative disruption that challenges systematic planning. The attempt to construct ideologies comprehensive enough to address all aspects of human life and account for all individual variations was fundamentally misguided. The most extreme examples of this folly can be observed in Stalin's Soviet Union and Pol Pot's Cambodia, where attempts at total rational control led to unprecedented human suffering.

The failure of modern institutions to meet popular expectations—however unrealistic those expectations might be—has fundamentally discredited the ontological

assumptions of Enlightenment rationalism. Ideology proves insufficiently capacious to accommodate the full varieties and depths of human experience. While ideological thinking provides a shortcut from conception to action, it ultimately fails to provide the lifetime of meaning, inspiration, and comfort that human beings require for psychological and spiritual well-being.

Post-Enlightenment Fragmentation

Our contemporary post-Enlightenment world is characterized by the assertion that truth is relative, that personal experience constitutes expertise, and that identity determines destiny. There is no longer even a pretense of objectivity, as evidenced by the proliferation of partisan digital media outlets that explicitly cater to particular worldviews and political preferences. This represents a multiplicity without underlying unity, a dispersal of meaning without any gathering principle or shared foundation.

For any society to remain viable over time, the twin processes of creation and destruction must tilt decisively in favor of creation, enabling positive accommodation of difference and diversity. This principle applies both economically—where innovation must outpace decay—and socially, where bridge-building must exceed boundary-drawing. Contemporary research in psychology and neuroscience confirms that most human actions emerge from unconscious emotional reactions that are subsequently rationalized through post-hoc reasoning. To act primarily through rationality requires the development of disciplined virtue and conscious practice.

Most of the time, human beings live through stories—narrative frameworks that provide meaning, purpose, and direction. Having overarching stories that inspire while remaining ultimately unattainable gives life meaning and purpose that extends beyond immediate circumstances. Secular stories, however compelling they might be in limited contexts, can only go so far in providing the depth of meaning and existential support that human beings require. Superman might serve as effective inspiration for a child developing moral imagination, but proves an inadequate patron saint for a cancer patient confronting mortality and ultimate questions.

The Death and Rebirth of Multiculturalism

"Der Ansatz für Multikulti ist gescheitert, absolut gescheitert!" ("The approach to multiculturalism has failed, absolutely failed!") declared German Chancellor Angela Merkel in 2010 (Kymlicka, 2014). The proclaimed death of multiculturalism, particularly prominent in European political discourse, reflects an anxious reckoning with the practical realities of living alongside the Muslim other in contemporary European societies.

In Germany, citizens of Turkish origin; in France, those of Maghreb heritage; and in the United Kingdom, people of Pakistani background, do not easily conform to

prevailing national ideals of what constitutes the authentic body politic. Migration to European metropolitan centers during and after the colonial period has created an uncomfortable reckoning with historical legacies that continue to define everyday contemporary realities.

The French requirement that naturalized citizens adopt French names epitomizes the assimilationist desire to rewrite identity according to normative French ideals. This act of cultural Gallicization stands in direct opposition to Anglophone concepts of multiculturalism, which celebrate ethnic diversity as a positive social good, at least in principle. The Anglophone sphere can more easily adopt this celebratory approach because of its reliance on capitalism—which emerged historically from Protestant cultural values—as the primary mechanism for social and economic organization.

Class stratification is inherent to capitalist systems, and class categories can cut across racial and ethnic lines or become synonymous with them, depending on particular historical circumstances. However, the type of corporate capitalism practiced in North America, particularly below executive leadership levels, has demonstrated a capacity to overlook ethnic, racial, and religious differences in favor of marketable skills and profit-generating capabilities.

Diversity has proven beneficial for business success, both in generating innovation through varied perspectives and in connecting organizations to diverse domestic and international markets. The American commitment to economic success—what might be called the worship of the almighty dollar—has enabled the integration of highly educated immigrants into middle and upper classes more rapidly than any other Western society. Class solidarity helps maintain social stability despite the centrifugal forces of ethnic and racial identities that threaten to dissolve social contracts through politics based on historical grievance and zero-sum competition.

Multiculturalism depends on both the liberal ideal of fundamental equality among all individuals and cultural relativism, which assumes the equal validity of all cultural traditions and practices. Nationalism, as understood in the modern context, requires an overarching narrative about the country, its people, shared history, and common values. From the religious wars that shaped early modern Europe to the global conflicts of the twentieth century, tremendous violence has been necessary to ensure the continuity of ideal national forms within unpredictable historical realities.

Ethnic minorities rarely find ready places within traditional national narratives unless those stories undergo radical revision, as attempted by projects like the 1619 Project (Gordon-Reed et al., 2022), which centers the experience of slavery as constitutive of American founding rather than the traditional narrative of Pilgrims arriving at Plymouth Rock in 1620. Such reframings attempt to create more inclusive national stories but often generate fierce resistance from those invested in established narratives.

The challenge becomes how to acknowledge historical wrongs while maintaining optimistic views of national history and future possibilities. The humility and self-reflection required to create genuinely inclusive societies and broaden national narratives to incorporate multiple historical perspectives demand moral courage and the practice of forgiveness that enables movement beyond the politics of anger, othering, and perpetual grievance.

The Dialectical Challenge of Historical Revision

Rewriting history to create inclusive presents proves inevitably cacophonous; every individual and group possesses multiple perspectives that differ from others in fundamental ways. Both liberal and conservative voices often speak past each other in ways that make genuine dialogue difficult and consensus-building nearly impossible. Hegel's dialectical process—thesis, antithesis, synthesis—functions effectively only when participants engage in genuine perspective-taking and demonstrate willingness to compromise and find common ground.

When identity becomes dogma, finding middle ground becomes extremely challenging. What emerges from hyper-individualized political identities is often a form of tribalism that constantly shifts according to ever-evolving orthodoxies and purity tests. Hersh describes this phenomenon as "political hobbyism" that destroys political cultures based on action-oriented, long-term engagement with community life and public goods (Hersh, 2020).

In democratic societies, the psychological insecurity of individuals contributes to exceptionally turbulent politics and rapid changes in political allegiance and priority. While people living under authoritarian regimes may experience even greater insecurity regarding property rights and personal survival, they lack mechanisms for political expression of such concerns, which explains why regime changes in authoritarian contexts often appear sudden and surprising to outside observers.

A new social contract adapted to twenty-first-century realities is urgently needed to stabilize and integrate citizens' various identities within cohesive narratives of national belonging that transcend narrow tribal affiliations. Historically, one approach to this challenge involves prioritizing group identity over individual preference. We observe this confessional model in contemporary Lebanon, which originated in the Ottoman millet system that granted autonomy to different religious communities within a larger imperial framework.

Historically, societies that we now characterize as multicultural—such as the Roman Empire at its height—were typically not based on theological dialogue or cultural synthesis but rather on parallel communities that maintained respectful distances while acknowledging differences, often while maintaining assumptions of cultural superiority. The question becomes how much individual integration across group boundaries needs to occur to sustain healthy and flourishing societies that can accommodate the super-diversity unique to our technological age.

Interfaith Engagement in Theory and Practice

Interfaith engagement in Western contexts typically seeks common ethical and moral foundations as bridges between different communities, expressing these commonalities through service-oriented activities that translate religious commitment into practical action. The quintessential example is the interfaith food pantry, where

people of different faiths collaborate to address hunger and poverty without requiring theological agreement.

But in poorer societies with clear religious majorities—such as Honduras—what constitutes meaningful interreligious engagement? How relevant is the Western interfaith model for addressing fundamental social challenges in such contexts? Wealthier multicultural societies like the United Arab Emirates and Singapore require social cohesion to function effectively but do not typically provide individuals with the same stake in national futures that citizenship offers in Western democracies.

This raises fundamental questions about the optimal management of religious diversity: Is multiculturalism best achieved through tolerance—which requires minimal knowledge about others, only respect for their autonomy—or through active pluralistic engagement that involves deeper understanding and relationship-building? Minority religious groups often perceive active pluralism as threatening because of legitimate fears that sustained contact might lead to conversion or cultural assimilation. Tolerance, by contrast, does not require extensive knowledge about others, only mutual respect for boundaries and basic human dignity.

How much diversity is actually necessary for human flourishing, understood as both economic innovation and social harmony? Are all cultural values truly equal, and do universal core values exist upon which multicultural societies can be successfully built? How much must different groups know about one another to enable peaceful coexistence without sacrificing their distinctive identities and practices?

The widespread uncertainty about the goals and effectiveness of interfaith dialogue and education observed across different societies stems from fundamental misunderstandings about the nature of religion itself. The academic field of religious studies is frequently confused with theology, despite representing fundamentally different approaches to understanding religious phenomena. Religious studies pursues secular and, in the European sense, scientific investigation of religion as a function of human identity formation and social interaction. It is not concerned with preaching particular doctrines or facilitating conversions.

Similarly, authentic interfaith dialogue is not about conversion but about developing better understanding of others and their ways of making meaning. The challenges facing both religious studies as an academic discipline and interfaith dialogue as a social practice stem partly from colonial legacies and their embedding within secular pedagogical frameworks that often misunderstand the deep cultural contexts within which religious traditions operate.

The Political Economy of Knowledge and Sacred Wisdom

The Western conception of scientific understanding derives from ancient and medieval traditions that developed systematic approaches to comprehending the world through encyclopedic knowledge accumulation. Consider Pliny the Elder's Natural History, composed during the first century CE (Murphy, 2004), which

attempted to catalog all known information about the natural world. The encyclopedia as a knowledge form was invented in Ancient Rome, continued as an imperial project with Encyclopedia Britannica as a product of British imperial ambition, and today finds expression in Wikipedia's democratized information sharing.

This approach to knowledge assumes that knowing something means not only learning about it but also acquiring the capacity to control and manipulate it. This instrumental view of knowledge explains why sacred wisdom has historically been compartmentalized and restricted, from the Greek Eleusinian Mysteries to Ismaili esotericism to the indigenous traditions of the Miccosukee. Interfaith dialogue represents an opening of previously protected knowledge—a democratization of sacred information that makes traditional wisdom available for universal access and utilization.

For many traditional religious communities, the greatest spiritual truths remain hidden, revealed only to those deemed worthy through extended preparation, moral development, and community recognition. The interfaith movement thrives in open societies where free exchange of ideas is protected and encouraged, but this openness can appear threatening to communities that understand sacred knowledge as requiring careful protection and gradual transmission.

Interfaith dialogue can be perceived as connected to proselytization or understood as a theological trap, particularly within Christianity and Islam, which are explicitly missionary religions. Both traditions contain theological provisions exempting from damnation those who never heard their message and therefore could not accept or reject it. From this perspective, interfaith dialogue becomes problematic because unconverted participants who hear and then reject religious truth claims may, according to conservative interpretations of both traditions, face eternal consequences for their informed rejection.

The aims of interfaith activities can range from laying foundations for cross-cultural communication during crises—such as terrorist incidents—to showcasing particular religious beliefs to gain funding, political support, or public exposure. Determining who can legitimately speak for faith traditions presents another persistent challenge in interfaith work.

Generally, those actively engaged in interfaith dialogue tend toward the more pluralistic end of their respective faith spectrums. Most participants are already convinced of dialogue's importance both for their personal faith commitments and as a positive social force for community cohesion and development. They typically believe that solidarity and understanding among people of similar progressive dispositions can radiate outward through faith communities to broader populations.

However, these pluralistic representatives generally lack significant public profiles and tend to come from globalized, highly educated elites whose impact on majority population attitudes toward religious others remains limited. Interfaith dialogue tends to attract particular demographics: highly educated individuals formed within liberal intellectual traditions. The persistent challenge involves expanding this discourse beyond these narrow circles into broader populations.

Communication Barriers and Orthodox Resistance

Three major communication challenges impede the expansion of interfaith understanding. The first involves language barriers, both discourse within local languages and the use of English as an international communication medium. Are interfaith concepts even translatable across different linguistic and cultural contexts? Can ideas developed within particular cultural frameworks maintain their meaning when expressed in fundamentally different language systems?

The second challenge involves making interfaith engagement orthodox rather than marginal within religious traditions. Currently, among most world religions, interfaith activity remains on the periphery of mainstream religious life. One notable exception is the Catholic Church's 1965 Nostra Aetate declaration by the Second Vatican Council, which stated:

> "The Church, therefore, exhorts her sons, that through dialogue and collaboration with the followers of other religions, carried out with prudence and love and in witness to the Christian faith and life, they recognize, preserve and promote the good things, spiritual and moral, as well as the socio-cultural values found among these men" (Valkenberg, 2016).

The third challenge involves disseminating interfaith knowledge through networks of people with religious authority within different countries, enabling broad-based distribution of interfaith perspectives. Interfaith dialogue, both as methodology and epistemology, has not achieved mainstream acceptance in global politics and remains underutilized for conflict resolution and peace-building initiatives.

The methodology of interfaith dialogue continues evolving to achieve more effective psychological and emotional changes in participants. The relationship and network building that emerges, the civil society linkages that are strengthened, and the long-term impacts of sustained engagement can lead to innovations and partnerships extending beyond social interaction into political and economic dimensions of community life.

Most interfaith dialogue projects remain theologically superficial because participants are typically not specialists within their own traditions. Scholarly interfaith dialogue usually remains confined to rare academic conferences and specialized journal publications. Yet religion as lived experience in interfaith dialogue can provide valuable insights into one's own tradition, particularly in responding to universal human conditions such as suffering and in reflecting on life's major transitions: birth, marriage, and death.

Indeed, meaningful interfaith dialogue need not focus primarily on doctrinal differences or theological debates. Faith increasingly functions as personal identity rather than systematic belief in our postmodern context. People can engage in service projects, share meals, and discuss life's challenges without necessarily addressing fundamental theological differences. Coming together to create greater belonging serves as a model for how faith identities can remain permeable and expansive, unlike contemporary concepts of nationhood, which tend toward rigid exclusivity.

Equality, Dignity, and the Soul

The principle of equality proves essential to authentic interfaith dialogue. How different groups approach each other as fellow citizens within nations depends on modern understandings of individual rights and responsibilities. While few people directly engage in dehumanizing actions toward others, many unconsciously diminish others' humanity through descriptive terms such as "refugee," "migrant," or "illegal" that reduce complex human beings to problematic categories.

From secular Western political perspectives, individual autonomy and idealized equality are based on the corporeal reality of human beings as members of the same biological species, deriving from natural law assumptions about shared humanity. The historical progression from the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen by the French Constituent Assembly in 1789 to universal suffrage represents the gradual expansion of this principle. Within liberal worldviews, this progression represents ongoing movement toward greater equality as a progressive historical development.

Both dictators and democrats might agree on principles of universal equality, but their definitions of what equality means and how it should be implemented differ dramatically. Is the individual simply a human being, or something more substantial? Secular political systems typically aim to constrain bodies and direct minds toward production and consumption, whether within neoliberal capitalist economies or authoritarian state systems.

Religion possesses the potential to release primordial forces within humanity that disrupt existing power distributions, as witnessed from medieval Crusades to the establishment of the Islamic Republic of Iran in 1979. Faith can prove unruly and challenge established orders. Indeed, the founders of great faith traditions were typically moral disruptors who advocated radical morality when confronting hierarchical systems of oppression and injustice.

Historically, religious and political thought understood individuals as integral parts of larger collectives, viewing individual salvation as inseparable from governmental responsibilities. Governments were expected not only to preserve material progress but also to sustain moral orders necessary for human flourishing. The spiritual dimension was embedded throughout everyday life, which explains why modernist religious reformers frequently describe faith as a "way of life" or, as Wittgenstein characterized it, a "form of life" (Gier, 1980).

The separation of sacred from mundane represents a distinctively Western approach that creates significant misunderstandings when applied to Asian societies. Much of what demographers and pollsters fail to understand when conducting survey research in Asian contexts stems from this artificial separation. Belief expresses itself through countless cultural manifestations: language patterns, food practices, family relationships, economic exchanges, and numerous other dimensions of daily existence.

Traditional religious practices represent accumulated millennia of familial and communal habits that form individual identity as part of larger collectives. This deep

embedding makes living traditions extremely difficult to explain to outsiders and challenging to reconstitute when transplanted to foreign contexts. Urban environments require various shorthand identity markers to differentiate individuals when traditional community contexts are absent.

Multiple new identities may be imposed on individuals in cosmopolitan settings: class and professional categories, religious and regional affiliations, ethnic markers, and ideological positions. Religion as lived experience becomes summarized into simplified tenets, adorned with visible symbols, and communicated as primordial identity in relation to others. It transforms into another brand among countless lifestyle brands through which individuals can signal values and communicate belonging to particular social circles.

As an identity marker, religion frequently manifests through virtue signaling, endorsing or rejecting aspects of popular culture, and enhancing one's prestige as a cultural arbiter within specific communities. This commodification represents a significant departure from religion as comprehensive way of life toward religion as lifestyle accessory and identity performance.

The Social Architecture of Human Flourishing

Human beings are fundamentally social creatures, and relationships prove crucial to flourishing in both individualistic and communitarian societies. Individualistic societies prize individual efforts and attach moral significance to personal success or failure, while communitarian societies value cooperation and evaluate collaborative actions based on their contribution to overall societal effectiveness and harmony.

Relationships remain central to both social harmony and individual success, manifesting through concepts such as face-saving in communitarian contexts and public reputation management in individualistic settings. Even in highly individualistic societies, people rarely achieve success based solely on personal merit; social connections typically smooth paths to achievement through job opportunities, educational access, business partnerships, and professional networks.

Individuals constantly engage in forging, maintaining, and seeking new relationships as pathways to future success through shared meals, gift exchanges, regular communication, and increasingly through social media platforms that extend traditional relationship-building into digital spaces. These relationship networks provide both practical benefits and psychological support essential for navigating complex modern societies.

Covenantal pluralism expresses the fundamental importance of community and reciprocal relationships while enabling religious diversity and protecting individual rights. It enhances communal religious identity while acknowledging that individuals possess inalienable dignity that transcends group membership. This framework embodies principles essential to flourishing in both individualistic and communitarian societies without requiring the abandonment of either approach.

Covenantal pluralism differs from secular rights-based approaches where individuals primarily demand positive or negative concessions from state authority. Instead, it emphasizes mutual obligations and shared responsibilities that emerge from recognition of fundamental human dignity rooted in both individual worth and communal belonging.

Autocratic leaders frequently argue that human rights concepts are foreign imports from Western societies rather than indigenous developments. Whether or not this claim proves historically accurate, the crucial issue involves the connection between human rights discourse and democratic experiments since decolonization. Most democratic governments, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, have struggled to deliver the economic improvements promised to rapidly growing populations. For many people, adequate food and economic security appear more important than voting for politicians who seem interchangeable despite different party symbols.

Faith operates through action with and for others rather than individual contemplation alone. Communitarian societies, where individual success may prove more difficult to achieve, typically enable broader resource distribution across wider populations. In Tanzania, for example, wealthy individuals are expected to support poorer community members, and fulfilling this obligation enhances social reputation while failure to do so can result in community rejection.

Sustaining one's position as a "big man" becomes increasingly difficult over time because successful family members must continuously support less fortunate relatives through financial assistance and gift-giving. Meeting these obligations proves essential for maintaining harmonious relationships with extended families and broader communities. Social pressure to conform connects directly to identity formation and self-esteem within community contexts.

While individual failure can be mitigated through communal success, communitarian societies can generate fatalism—the sense that forces governing life's fortunes exceed what individual actions can influence. When systemic factors appear to determine outcomes, individual agency seems limited and social change becomes difficult to imagine or achieve.

Collective Identity and Interfaith Relations

Communalism has profound implications for how people relate to each other: as community to community and nation to nation rather than as isolated individuals. Judaism exemplifies this approach within Western contexts, functioning simultaneously as both peoplehood and religion. Despite internal diversity, Jewish communities maintain recognizable collective perspectives and engagement patterns that reflect shared culture and historical experience.

Faith traditions can engage other social groups as collectives with distinctive norms and values rather than placing burdens on individuals to represent both personal and collective beliefs simultaneously. The communal dimension of identity

in interfaith dialogue incorporates understanding of broader community commitments, of which belief represents only one component. This approach blends social and spiritual dimensions in understanding how faith lives through people and institutions created to develop and sustain religious communities across time.

The Abrahamic traditions (Judaism, Christianity, Islam) and most Dharmic traditions (Hinduism, Sikhism, Jainism), with Buddhism as a notable exception, affirm the existence of eternal souls. Within Dharmic frameworks, the souls of both conscious and unconscious beings represent reincarnations of past lives that partially determine rebirth within hierarchical arrangements of existence and influence success within human communities.

Western governments do not acknowledge souls as legitimate units of analysis or policy measurement. Political focus remains on providing citizens sufficient access to resources for material thriving, which represents technocratic policymaking at its most ambitious. However, effective resource distribution does not necessarily generate harmonious societies or satisfied citizenries. Economic prosperity can coexist with widespread dissatisfaction and anxiety that expresses itself through electoral politics and social unrest.

The relationship between soul (or Buddhist no-self) and physical body differs significantly across religious traditions. Near Eastern traditions, from ancient Egyptian religion to contemporary Islam, typically located the heart as the body's center, with soul or soul-components residing within cardiac regions. Eastern traditions such as Daoism, Buddhism, and traditional Chinese medicine understand health as harmonious equilibrium between interacting forces: yin and yang energies, five internal elements (metal, wood, water, fire, earth), and six environmental conditions (dry, wet, hot, cold, wind, flame) (Ke, 2023).

Body and unknowable spirit animate physical existence during life but can be separated to achieve spiritual progress through practices such as asceticism, which seeks to discipline bodily desires by weakening physical attachments so authentic spiritual dimensions can achieve enlightenment or salvation.

Spiritual Technology and Material Progress

Spiritual progress has failed to keep pace with scientific and technological advancement. The philosophical dead end of nihilism that Western societies reached through abandoning religious meaning combined with twentieth-century atrocities has left souls adrift without transcendent anchoring. No revolutionary spiritual technologies have emerged since Indic meditation practices developed millennia ago; vast resources of modern civilization have concentrated on perfecting material technologies while spiritual development receives minimal attention or resources.

Material comfort for physical bodies does not automatically generate enlightened souls or psychological well-being. Contemporary mental health crises in wealthy societies demonstrate that material prosperity alone cannot address fundamental human needs for meaning, purpose, and transcendent connection.

Prioritizing spiritual flourishing proves critical for modern social success. Even communist and post-communist societies from Azerbaijan to Vietnam recognize spirituality's importance for daily ethical functioning and social cohesion. The ultimate purpose (telos) of Western civilization appears increasingly unclear and unconvincing, while Eastern societies connect their aspirations to glorious historical reawakenings and strive for enhanced global influence during contemporary power realignments.

Embedded communal spirituality, evident in locations as diverse as Indonesia and South America, provides essential spiritual support for individuals confronting individualized modernity's challenges, where economic precarity and psychological demands can overwhelm many people's capacity for success and fulfillment.

Confronting existential risks during the climate change era through spiritual practice, identity formation, and solidarity enables both spiritual innovation and adaptation drawing from worldwide traditions. This process unearths historical wisdom while revealing global differences and possibilities. The emergence of new religious movements in urban centers across the developed world exemplifies spiritual needs, aspirations, and attempts to reconcile secular and sacred dimensions of contemporary life.

Historical Patterns of Diversity and Exchange

The multiculturalism and diversity of contemporary societies enabled by information revolution technologies represent unprecedented historical developments. Cosmopolitanism historically emerged as an economic phenomenon in trading ports where diverse goods and ideas were exchanged, or in imperial centers that attracted ambitious and curious people from widespread territories.

Religious traditions were typically tied to specific communities as ethnic inheritances transported from place to place, where tolerance correlated with economic power and political influence. Understanding others' faiths proved important primarily insofar as religious differences affected business relationships or political standing. Judaism challenged the Roman state by rejecting emperor worship, contributing to political resistance that culminated in the Second Temple's destruction in 70 CE.

Traders and trading communities have historically played crucial roles in developing diverse societies, providing social lubrication in contexts of potential friction. These interactions generated new cultures and pidgin languages enabling cultural mixing that inevitably created new communities where sacred traditions were shared with subsequent generations. Chinese-English pidgin illustrates both opportunities and limitations of cross-cultural engagement through language adaptation. Christianity's failure to establish deep roots in Japan provides another instructive example of cultural resistance to foreign religious influence.

Trading communities can also become repositories of conservatism because sustained engagement with others makes differences more stark between one's

own beliefs and practices and those of encountered others. Research on Indian Ocean trading ports demonstrates how and why particular forms of religious conservatism emerged among migrating merchant communities (Subramanian, 2010). Traders dealt with extremely diverse human populations while navigating boom-and-bust economic cycles and encountering people ranging from sincere partners to sophisticated fraudsters.

The inherent insecurity and fluctuation of commercial life makes traders receptive to superstitious practices and supernatural explanations for success and failure. Consider the biblical story of Jonah and the whale as an example of seafaring spiritual anxiety. Most human populations before the twentieth century remained rural, with foreign interactions occurring primarily at geographical peripheries or political centers. Mass transportation and communication technologies increased these interactions exponentially, with immigration becoming among the most politically salient issues in contexts of both climate change and social fragmentation.

Super-Diversity and Economic Necessity

The super-diversity characteristic of our historical moment results from economic necessity, as diverse workforces have been attracted to centers of political and economic dominance. For capitalism to continue in current forms, it must sustain growth, innovation, and efficiency while producing goods and services consumed by more than eight billion human inhabitants across the globe.

China and the United States provide contrasting examples of attracting human and material capital while maintaining narrative fictions about national identity and purpose. Chinese approaches focus on becoming the world's manufacturing center, exporting products and technologies while minimizing imports and cultural influence from abroad. Western strategies depend more heavily on immigration to generate innovation and economic growth. These different models require fundamentally different political and social relationships among their respective populations.

The Chinese approach continues imperial political models shaped by millennia of agricultural empire rise and decline, interactions with nomadic peoples such as the Xiongnu, and the Hua-Yi distinction between civilized and barbarian populations. While interfaith models connect to pluralism, multiculturalism, and democratic coalition-building, current Chinese governmental approaches emphasize homogeneity and the systematic reduction of difference.

The Sinic Han identity represents a mythological narrative when examined through the genetic diversity evident within majority populations. The narrative of Chinese people versus barbarian others has structured Chinese society where internal diversity—exemplified by Tibetans, Mongolians, and Uyghurs—is perceived as threatening long-term state stability. Instead, a controlled form of diversity is celebrated where majority populations and state authority manage cultural expressions of minority groups to prevent them from articulating independent spiritual and political destinies.

The Anglophone Western model treats class (wealth) rather than ethnicity as the primary determinant of social position. Race remains a persistent issue, but one that can be mitigated through wealth accumulation in ways impossible within Sinosphere contexts. Diversity is rhetorically celebrated as positive because it enables access to diverse markets and populations both domestically and globally.

Understanding other cultures and religious traditions to accommodate diversity is generally viewed positively because most Americans have immigrant backgrounds or are immigrants themselves. There is recognition that no single nation or people can produce all ideas and materials necessary to sustain global superpower status. The US immigration system prioritizes educated professionals who can contribute knowledge and expertise to national development.

For established citizenries to positively engage with difference and understand the world as expanding opportunity rather than zero-sum competition, they need education about diversity's benefits and contributions. The mentality of scarcity has characterized human existence from the beginning of social organization; only recently, through industrialization, has this condition been mitigated in developed societies.

Identifying with similar others and hoarding resources against potential catastrophe represents genetically embedded survival strategies. Inciting xenophobia provides the easiest method for politicizing and polarizing electorates because of evolved dispositions toward suspicious evaluation of others. Religious traditions attempt to facilitate human evolution beyond this perspective by creating meta-narratives of being and belonging that transcend daily experiences and invoke spiritual imaginaries of life, afterlife, and global communion among believers.

However, the radical origins of religious traditions are frequently routinized into hierarchical power structures that reinforce state narratives against fictitious others that supposedly threaten community survival and prosperity.

Climate Crisis and Future Demographics

The demographic decline affecting developed societies, combined with mass displacement of more than one billion people living in low-lying coastal regions threatened by storms and rising sea levels, will make increased diversity an existential necessity rather than optional policy choice. Advanced industrialized societies will require people from the Majority World to staff institutions and maintain economic productivity.

While automation can increase industrial production efficiency, human beings remain necessary for innovation and providing personal care that cannot be mechanized. The nation-state model inherently limits who belongs and who qualifies as a natural and productive citizen. Japan and China maintain bounded concepts of nationhood that correlate with state membership while providing minimal cultural space for foreigners as equals.

Societies capable of attracting global talent demonstrate either cultural humility toward others or nationalist pride tempered by practical necessity. Dubai and Singapore have become global hubs for digital nomads and international professionals precisely because they have created inclusive environments that welcome diverse contributions while maintaining social stability.

Politically, immigration issues tend to conflate refugees with criminality and social undesirability. Immigrants are perceived as people out of place who operate according to different value systems from majority populations. The specter of immigration provides emotional appeals that can rapidly solidify political support for candidates across the democratic-authoritarian spectrum.

The post-secular West has employed implicit Christian cultural frameworks as rationales for preventing immigrants from Muslim-majority countries from entering the European Union, affecting free movement policies for countries such as Albania, Bosnia, and most significantly, Turkey. Despite religion not being actively observed by majority Western European populations, Christianity as cultural construct becomes more important for defining Muslims as others.

Even ostensibly secular societies maintain built-in religious sensibilities that enable discrimination, which must be addressed when attempting to create more egalitarian social arrangements. Religious communities across traditions have attempted to repair humanity's division into distinct tribes since the Tower of Babel narrative. Compassion toward immigrant others will prove essential both as religious value and secular principle during the age of polycrisis.

Internal displacement and migration levels exceed all historical precedents, according to the International Organization for Migration (Hrytsyshena et al., 2024). Less discussed but equally significant is rural-to-urban migration that increases both pluralistic coexistence and reactive opposition to difference. Urban areas function as engines of economic growth and activity that fuel national development and subsequently enable rural improvements.

Ironically, people living in disappearing rural communities often express the most vehement opposition to immigration policies and multicultural initiatives that could revitalize their regions through new economic activity and population growth.

Immigration as Creative Disruption

Immigration introduces new energy into closed social systems. Immigrants possess different experiential backgrounds expressed through alternative languages and distinctive approaches to understanding and creating meaning from world encounters. Many Western Nobel laureates, including Albert Einstein, were immigrants who brought external perspectives that generated breakthrough innovations.

"Unexceptional" immigrants who constitute the majority of immigrant populations in urban, rural, and suburban America also generate change through resilience and entrepreneurship, from operating 24-h convenience stores in underserved neighborhoods to educating children for professional success. Immigration stimulates

innovation by requiring native populations to develop enhanced skills to remain competitive.

This dynamic also creates political backlash because immigrants often accept lower-wage employment while a small proportion possess advanced training for elite careers. This creates disconnection where native birth provides no automatic advantage within capitalist firms focused on delivering shareholder value rather than rewarding citizenship status.

Human beings live on land rather than water. Fundamental to evolved human nature is perception of solid foundations upon which identity and meaning-making can be constructed. Displacement from certainty and familiar territory encourages mental grounding in unchanging visions of past that present circumstances cannot alter.

Experiencing time unidirectionally—from present toward future—enables creation of past imaginaries that can be inhabited and drawn upon during present experiences. This capacity facilitates human mobility because homes exist within minds rather than specific geographical locations. However, adjustment to new information becomes more difficult with age as previous experiences become increasingly opaque filters for perceiving present and future possibilities.

According to current brain development research, the most crucial years for cognitive growth span from birth to six years of age, after which mental plasticity decreases with aging (Gale et al., 2004). Exposing children to diverse people and experiences during early development proves far more cost-effective than attempting to reverse embedded prejudices later in life.

Education, Prejudice, and Transformation

Discrimination exists across all societies: in Western contexts it expresses most clearly through racism, while Eastern forms range from casteism and colorism to classism and regional prejudice. Interfaith pluralism education provides analytical tools for critically examining society rather than indoctrinating people into liberal value systems to be imposed on others.

Effective pluralism education applies critical thinking to various forms of prejudice, including antiracism training that can unfortunately develop into its own secular theology when poorly implemented. At its best, interfaith pluralism education transcends mere fact presentation or alternative explanations to fundamentally unsettle existing belief foundations (episteme), enabling people to move through the world differently through awakening to previously dismissed or unnoticed realities.

This education enhances sensitivity to people, places, and experiences that constitute others' lived realities. As social movement, pluralism education uses whatever privilege individuals possess—whether derived from class advantage or majority status—both to educate peers and advocate for dispossessed populations. This advocacy contains karmic qualities where past actions shape present circumstances and

current choices influence future outcomes based on whether individuals or nations embrace others and benefit from diversity.

The spiritual challenge involves increasing compassion toward others. Christianity addresses this through Girard's scapegoat mechanism focused on Jesus, whose crucifixion directs attention toward victims and otherworldly salvation (Fretschel-Hojarski, 2024). While such compassion may have provided evolutionary advantages, spiritual masters across traditions teach the illusory nature of self-other distinctions, focusing instead on I-Thou relationships (Buber, 1970).

Discrimination and racism stem from flawed conceptions of reality that create artificial separations between people. Dispelling these illusions represents areas where Indic and Dharmic traditions such as Jainism and Buddhism prove particularly effective, demonstrating how thought creates action through right view, intention, speech, action, livelihood, effort, mindfulness, and concentration. Within these frameworks, mental states precede and shape the realities people create.

The Dhammapada begins with this foundational insight:

> Preceded by Perception Are Mental States,
> For Them is Perception Supreme,
> From Perception Have They Sprung.
> If, with Perception Polluted, One Speaks or Acts,
> Thence Suffering Follows
> As a Wheel the Draught Ox's Foot.

Sufi traditions similarly understand tauhid (unity of God) as more than simple monotheism. Instead, it means all creation remains connected—and all un-creation remains connected as well. What preceded, exists, and shall exist are interconnected across time, encompassing both seen and unseen worlds: the seven realms of heaven and earth.

Cosmology, Science, and Spirit

Contemporary cosmology as Western material science faces crisis because standard models of the universe cannot account for most matter and universal creation (Kroupa, 2012). These elements are categorized as dark matter, itself a catch-all theory accounting for mathematical discrepancies between standard models and observable universe realities.

Recent decades have witnessed cosmologists collaborating with Buddhist monks on multiverse theories. Scientist Rupert Sheldrake, working at the periphery of cosmological studies, advocates for panpsychism (Watts, 2011), which appears to represent secularized versions of Jain concepts of jiva (conscious beings) existing in all things, from animate to inanimate existence, in varying levels of awareness.

Religious traditions contain vast metaphysical resources that might bridge divisions between observed understanding of cosmos and realities beyond subatomic

levels. Such bridges could provide coherent narratives of creation and human existence as connected to universal consciousness (atman). The challenge in science-religion dialogue involves Western academic epistemologies focused on physical reality that have abandoned metaphysical inquiry as legitimate study since its last systematic engagement in the Anglophone West during the Victorian era.

Covenantal pluralism seeks to transcend individual rights in relation to others and state authority while engaging different paradigms of interfaith encounter based on historical precedent and contemporary expressions. Indic models of interfaith dialogue typically focus on communal spheres, generating community action and reaction to others. Whether such approaches prove beneficial or problematic remains subjective, but they differ fundamentally from Western individualistic frameworks.

Similarly, foregrounding faith in interfaith dialogue might prove presumptuous or counterproductive depending on cultural contexts. Various ways of being human and multiple dynamic identities suggest that aspects of seen and unseen worlds can form understanding bridges that transcend intellectual and emotional dimensions to reach spiritual levels.

The permeable boundaries characteristic of Indic traditions, including Indic expressions of Abrahamic faiths (Christianity and Islam), allow greater degrees of spiritual exchange. In contrast, strict boundaries have developed within Abrahamic faiths precisely because they share similar origins and appear similar in orientation while differing in expression.

The consecrated food in Catholic mass celebrating Eucharist (the host) is reserved only for Catholics who have received communion. Conversely, Hindu prasad and Muslim nyaz are offered to and consumed by everyone present, not simply as food but with belief in transformational spiritual qualities benefiting all participants regardless of religious affiliation.

Ethnic Traditions and Universal Messages

Indic religious traditions tend to be ethnic and grounded in specific physical locations, except for Buddhism and, to lesser extent, Sikhism, which has adopted global missions through vernacularization. Sikhism bases itself on local Punjabi language and culture but evolved through the Khalsa into a universalistic message spread through service (seva), most visibly through community kitchens (langar) (Shackle, 2005).

Movements within Hinduism and Jainism, like Judaism, typically do not seek converts. These traditions make claims about ultimate reality's nature without requiring universal applicability. Even evangelical Buddhism respects others' truth claims and spiritual paths. In practice, however, religious nationalism in East Asia can prove as destructive as Middle Eastern variants.

After the September 11 attacks, Muslims worldwide were expected to condemn terrorism based on misconceptions that only "real" Muslims were violent ones while other Muslims were marginalized apologists for the tradition's "true" nature.

One major challenge for interfaith dialogue involves overcoming this silencing and transforming it into active listening and genuine engagement.

Current breakdowns in Jewish-Muslim relationships worldwide due to the Gaza War reflect how traditional ideals do not accord with ground realities and how existential fear of others closes off abilities to engage with alternative perspectives and hear different narratives.

Covenant, Supersession, and Theological Challenges

Within covenantal pluralism frameworks—based on mutual obligations toward each other to enable religious freedom and diversity—Muslim and Jewish traditions face unique challenges tied to covenant concepts. In Jewish tradition, the Abrahamic covenant creates special relationships marking communities as chosen by God. In Islamic tradition, covenant exists between community and God but also involves supersessionism, viewing Judaism as corrupted and Muhammad as the final prophet sealing valid universal monotheism.

Theological differences between traditions have increased over time. Islam's early development, including legal systems, was influenced by Arab Jewish traditions that appear distinct from mainstream Levantine communities, such as Arabian Jewish tribes that believed in Ezra as son of God (Quran 9:30). Shared heritage includes Jerusalem as original prayer direction and atonement fasting that became Islamic traditions later adapted in uniquely Islamic manners.

This adaptation process defined Islamic tradition as separate while recasting Jewish and Christian prophets and patriarchs as legendary archetypes. Islamic reinterpretation of Abraham as monotheist rather than first Jew allows spiritual genealogy through which Arabs can claim descent via Ishmael—but can also bridge contemporary interfaith dialogue among Jews, Muslims, and Christians.

While theology matters significantly, politics has intervened so that Jewish-Muslim relations today are viewed exclusively through Palestinian-Israeli conflict prisms rather than as results of centuries of mutual intellectual, cultural, and spiritual engagement, particularly among Sephardic Jewish communities. Jewish community insecurity worldwide has triggered existential crisis not experienced since World War II. For Muslims, Palestinian issues created the first global Muslim identity of the information age.

In the United States, Muslim racialization as ethnic identity after September 11 made the conflict religiously partisan in unprecedented ways. Insecurity underlies vulnerability that both communities experience in contemporary contexts.

The crucial question today involves not ending the Gaza War but creating cooperative futures by starting with shared missions: "repairing the world" (tikkun olam) and "enjoining good" (amr bil-ma'ruf) to promote global human flourishing (Winer, 2008). Tension between Muslim and Jewish communities reflects global challenges of living on an increasingly stressed planet when social and political institutions also face unprecedented pressures, leading to new forms of national tribalism.

The polycrisis—created by stressed political, social, and economic institutions of the twenty-first century—has revealed liberalism's limitations as previously conceived. Are intellectual and spiritual resources from Judaism and Islam available to help imagine futures that reinvent historical ideas about organizing and engaging diversity while maintaining community cohesion?

What would flourishing Jewish and Muslim communities look like in the United States, and what would achieving such flourishing require over the next century? How can these traditions remain relevant to younger generations for whom technological materialism and capitalist consumption prove more compelling than faith community rituals and traditional observances?

Syncretism and Boundary Formation

The blending of different religious practices and outlooks, known as syncretism, represents an essential component of interfaith dialogue within Indic traditions. Practitioners take beneficial elements from other religious traditions to build better understanding of universal, ineffable ultimate reality. Strict adherence to dogma is viewed as refuge for those with limited spiritual imagination who are unlikely to achieve meaningful spiritual progress.

Dharmic traditions maintain that spiritual advancement occurs over lifetimes through rebirth cycles. Abrahamic traditions of single life followed by afterlife create immediacy that drives both religious commitment and political engagement. Openness to other religious traditions was more prevalent before the monotheistic revolution beginning with Zoroastrianism but becoming absolute with Judaism.

Ironically, Hindu-Muslim tensions across contemporary South Asia do not represent medieval legacies as argued by some colonial historians but result from the Protestantization of originally flexible Indic traditions that transformed them into dogmatic traditions with rigid boundaries, organized and defined in opposition to others. Christianity's claim to supersede Judaism made Jews the existential other that persists even in post-Christian imagination, explaining why antisemitism continues emerging throughout Europe (Ben Johanan, 2024).

Hardened boundaries between modern religions make interfaith dialogue generational and ongoing work. Some speculated that globalization would collapse religions, as now predicted again in the artificial intelligence age. Reality has been ideological hardening against others as forms of identity politics (Ciftci et al., 2016). Religion as spirituality or mysticism has yielded to religion as identity—mental constructs of self that prove much harder to bridge than religion as pietistic practice.

Human Rights and Historical Recovery

Modern conceptions of human and religious rights evolved from ancient traditions, and Eastern contributions need acknowledgment to develop stronger international support for expanded language about religious freedom, human rights, and pluralism generally. The Cyrus Cylinder, containing royal decree by Babylonian kings in the sixth century BCE freeing slaves and establishing racial equality, represents perhaps the first extant human rights declaration.

This and similar documents should be studied to understand how human rights conceptions began in ancient past and how non-Western societies creatively addressed human dignity concepts that centuries later coalesced in global consensus with the UN Declaration of Human Rights.

Many Global South nations, because of more than two centuries of subordination to Western political and economic control, look to the past for inspiration and to account for contemporary weakness. For Hindus and Muslims, glorification and even rewriting of past helps address current perceptions of inequity and disrespect, whether active or neglectful, by Western powers.

This may involve highlighting conveniently forgotten documents such as Avicenna's five-volume Canon of Medicine, published in 1025 and used as textbook in European medical schools until the eighteenth century (Siraisi, 2014). Or exploration may unearth fantastical claims that Indians developed spacecraft, internet, and nuclear weapons thousands of years ago (Kumar, 2019).

Highlighting real or mythical pasts may provide pride in ancestral accomplishments while allowing contemporary weakness to be explained as temporary: Western hegemony will end because it actually depends on Eastern ideas and technologies that will someday be recovered to propel nations toward prosperous futures. China's rise has given hope to Global South nations that organizing society and resources to compete with and outsmart the West remains possible, using Asian approaches through partnerships of equals with African and other Asian nations.

Human rights and religious freedom discourse sometimes falls on deaf ears in the Global South not because Eastern societies have intrinsic tendencies toward despotism or lack appreciation for personal freedom, but because human rights discourse fails to acknowledge pre-Western past contributions and does not flow from or incorporate indigenous histories.

Western perceptions of political history maintain that human rights concepts originated in Ancient Greece and evolved through medieval eras to modernity, failing to acknowledge genesis in ancient non-Western civilizations. Accumulated knowledge of millennia formed foundations upon which modernity was built. Where would contemporary civilization be without Chinese inventions of paper and gunpowder or without Indic and Arabic contributions to mathematics?

The Postcolonial Condition

Imagine a prince reduced to poverty living in dilapidated palace. A wealthy person provides money but berates him for his condition. His family and children feel shamed by this treatment and vow to succeed and surpass the benefactor. This metaphor captures much of the postcolonial condition affecting the majority world.

The great historical arc has witnessed rise and fall of civilizations now compressed into nation-state boundaries and forced to create mythical histories that establish majorities and minorities in ways that did not previously exist. While prejudice and violence remain inherent to human nature, the types of internal conflicts characterizing much of the Global South today result from colonization experiences.

Religious literacy must now overcome colonial imagined belongings by appealing to older religious identities while creating commonalities through which mutual acknowledgment, respect, and bridge-building across differences becomes possible. Dialogue building both disassembles and reassembles by creating conditions for cognitive openness to personal transformation requiring separation from daily routine and societal expectations.

One challenge of dialogue involves maintaining openness after returning to normal life, similar to problems of preventing recidivism after prison release. Religious freedom discourses in Anglophone, Francophone, Russophone, and Sinophone contexts differ in focus and emphasis.

The American approach represents an aberration in its desire to see faith flourish while keeping religion safe from state power. Religion is viewed as a garden to be cultivated with diverse plants. In contrast, most societies worldwide fear religion controlling politics, leading people to extremism, or introducing unfamiliar gods. For this majority, religion represents weeds in the garden that strangle worthwhile growth.

Beyond conceptual differences in religious freedom discourse across Western languages, particularly French and English, practical economics proves critical to freedom and diversity flourishing. Sufficient resources must be available to allow space for and encourage difference to flourish.

The ongoing Darfur conflict over past decades represents polycrisis culmination—political legitimacy and identity breakdown, climate change-produced drought, economic collapse, and violence-generated insecurity that destroyed meaningful bridges for dialogue, much less reconciliation. South Sudan's failure as nation also provides conditions for continued conflict.

Where no resources exist, society becomes tribal and zero-sum, preventing rights respect or responsibility fulfillment. The prerequisite for interfaith dialogue as generative process is social stability through economic development. Material hope for better futures helps facilitate religious interchange. Societies that are economically stagnant and under oppressive regimes rarely achieve ecumenical cooperation because minorities become scapegoats through official propaganda or difference-based targeting.

State, Faith, and Secular Foundations

In much of the world, distinctions between state and faith are not separate but overlap and blend in all life aspects. Islam is described as a way of life rather than religion (Lewis & Churchill, 2008). This is not exclusive to political Islam. Within historically Christian contexts such as the United States and Northern Europe, religiously conservative views on abortion or ritual slaughter (halal and kosher) are imposed on diverse populations, as in Denmark (Twum-Danso Imoh, 2022).

Lines separating personal law from public civil codes, embedded in US founding documents, have recently blurred in Western contexts. The image of secularism presented to the Majority World suggests neutrality. Yet if law and justice foundations are Christian, then judgments flowing from them would be equally religious. Acknowledging these foundational principles would enable more honest global conversations about universal claims such as human rights.

Protestant Christianity's focus on individuals essentially concerns salvation, and key to salvation is individual relationship with God and belief. Orthodox and Catholic Christianity provide mechanisms for intercession and collective salvation making obedience to spiritual authority prerequisite to being saved, rather than the more demanding work of living according to divine ways.

Exceptions exist within Protestantism, such as Calvinism, but largely evangelical movements dominating Christian churches today, particularly in Africa and Asia, are based on personal belief and salvation through witnessing and conversion.

Evangelical Christianity poses particular challenges for interfaith dialogue because majorities view Islam as threatening. More than threat, Islam is considered satanic and part of Armageddon prophecy. Hostility toward Islam as demonic makes interfaith dialogue with many evangelical groups difficult because no good faith effort at understanding exists.

Interfaith encounters become evangelizing opportunities rather than understanding exchanges, and religious freedom issues, when raised in international contexts about lack thereof in Muslim countries, become proselytizing opportunities. Narratives within American evangelical communities suggest, as perceived regarding Iran, that millions of secret Christians await freedom from oppressive governments, which influenced President Trump's support for Israel in attacks on Iran's nuclear facilities hoping to weaken government and facilitate regime change.

American Middle East interventions over recent decades, particularly after 9/11, exemplify how religious differences define policy decisions that could have been different if interfaith engagement were statecraft policy.

Salvation, Community, and Global Connection

Judaism and Islam maintain more complicated relationships with salvation or grace mediated through community. Salvation involves both individual relationship with God and community ensuring that ritual obligations are performed to create communal relationship with and receive continued divine blessings.

Communities can perform rites on behalf of individuals and vice versa, so both Jews and Muslims see themselves as interconnected bodies across the world despite linguistic and cultural differences. Christians over centuries have attempted replicating this connection among coreligionists through dogma adoption, such as the Nicene Creed.

However, because of vernacularization, this has not succeeded: power asymmetries and cultural divergences over time have left church rituals and liturgy untranslatable in both language and emotional impact, as seen in charismatic movements.

Pluralism is urgently needed because it manages diversity and its concomitant power dynamics. How do you politically manage religious diversity with competing universality truth claims? The political question involves how much diversity can be allowed while enabling people to work together effectively.

Do policies change to manage diversity, or do people change to fit policies? Regulated differences can stimulate innovation and prove key to nation-state economic success in the twenty-first century. In Silicon Valley, majority of top tech company CEOs are immigrants. Their ethnic diversity is offset by shared ideology (techno-optimist capitalism) and class (upper-income professional).

Importing unregulated differences into existing ecosystems can prove extremely disruptive, as witnessed with more than one million immigrants from West Asia who arrived in Europe during 2015 or annual migrant caravans linking Central and South America to the Mexican border with the United States. The challenge involves managing the pace and scale of cultural change while maintaining social cohesion and economic stability.

Diversity can produce energy that proves either creative or chaotic depending on management approaches and receiving society preparedness. The demographic decline of economically developed societies has created more than capacity and productivity losses: it represents energy depletion for innovation and cultural vitality.

The simplest response to demographic decline, since no fertility policy globally has proven unequivocally successful, would involve welcoming workers and families from the Global South to the Global North. This approach remains unpalatable for self-perceived homogeneous nations such as Japan, where cultural preservation concerns override economic necessity.

A more promising model for addressing Western demographic collapse has been implemented in Finland, another traditionally homogeneous country. Finland is attracting people by bringing students from Asia and Africa, paying for education and living expenses so they can complete degrees and learn Finnish language, thereby becoming acculturated Finns. Anglophone colonial identities associated with values

rather than blood relationships prove more accommodating of pluralism because "the people" or "the nation" can evolve in response to changing circumstances.

Cognitive Limitations and Pluralistic Solutions

Cognitively, humans cannot handle multiplicity of possibilities confronting each decision-making moment, much less throughout everyday lives. Cognitive shortcuts prove necessary for functioning but remain both helpful and problematic in cosmopolitan ages. Assumptions about the world enable quick situation assessment based on previous experiences, allowing movement through life without intense reevaluation of innumerable data points during each interaction.

Collectively, these biases also exclude others from decision-making, especially at higher power levels. Evolutionary biology reveals that perceiving difference as danger represents hardwired traits that can be rewired through cognitive elasticity enabled by education. Pluralism can be understood as methodology for rewiring minds to use different pathways for experiencing others and creating inclusive societies that understand and evaluate others' true merit.

The challenge of increasing compassion toward others requires both individual transformation and systemic change. Educational approaches that expose people to diversity during formative years prove most effective, while adult education requires more intensive intervention to overcome embedded prejudices and assumptions.

Interfaith pluralism education at its best creates transformative experiences that fundamentally alter how individuals perceive and interact with difference. Rather than simply providing information about other religions or cultures, effective programs create opportunities for meaningful encounter that challenges assumptions and builds genuine relationships across difference.

Technology, Artificial Intelligence, and Spiritual Futures

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence and digital technologies presents both unprecedented opportunities and existential challenges for religious communities and interfaith relations. Some predict that AI will accelerate secularization by providing rational alternatives to religious meaning-making, while others argue that increased technological complexity will drive people toward spiritual traditions that address questions machines cannot answer.

The democratization of information through digital platforms has enabled religious communities to connect across traditional geographical and cultural boundaries, creating new forms of global religious identity and solidarity. Social media enables Muslims in different continents to participate in shared rituals and discussions, while Christian communities can access theological resources and spiritual guidance from around the world.

However, these same technologies can amplify religious extremism and facilitate the spread of divisive ideologies that undermine interfaith understanding. The challenge involves harnessing technology's connective potential while developing safeguards against its capacity for manipulation and radicalization.

Virtual reality and augmented reality technologies may soon enable people to experience religious practices and sacred spaces from different traditions in unprecedented ways. Imagine visiting virtual reconstructions of ancient temples, participating in meditation practices guided by AI spiritual teachers, or experiencing sacred texts through immersive storytelling technologies.

These developments raise profound questions about the nature of authentic spiritual experience and the role of embodied community in religious life. Can virtual religious experiences provide the same transformative power as physical gatherings? How do traditional concepts of sacred space and time adapt to digital environments?

Climate Change and Spiritual Responses

Climate change represents perhaps the greatest existential challenge facing human civilization, requiring unprecedented levels of global cooperation and individual transformation. Religious traditions possess unique resources for addressing both the practical and spiritual dimensions of environmental crisis.

Many indigenous traditions maintain sophisticated understandings of human relationship with natural systems, viewing environmental stewardship as sacred responsibility rather than optional preference. Buddhist concepts of interdependence provide frameworks for understanding how individual actions connect to global consequences, while Islamic principles of stewardship (khalifa) emphasize human responsibility for protecting creation.

Christian traditions are rediscovering creation theology that views environmental care as fundamental expression of faith rather than peripheral concern. Hindu concepts of ahimsa (non-violence) extend to relationships with all living beings, providing ethical foundations for sustainable living practices.

The challenge involves translating these spiritual resources into practical responses to climate crisis while fostering interfaith cooperation on environmental issues. Religious communities possess global networks, moral authority, and capacity for inspiring individual behavior change that could prove crucial for addressing climate challenges.

Interfaith environmental initiatives are emerging worldwide, from Buddhist-Christian collaborations on renewable energy projects to Muslim-Jewish partnerships on sustainable agriculture. These cooperations demonstrate how shared concern for planetary survival can transcend theological differences and create practical foundations for ongoing relationship and mutual understanding.

Economic Justice and Spiritual Values

Contemporary global economic inequalities challenge religious communities to articulate and implement visions of economic justice rooted in spiritual values rather than purely secular political ideologies. Most religious traditions contain sophisticated teachings about wealth distribution, economic ethics, and responsibilities toward the poor and marginalized.

Islamic banking principles, prohibiting usury (riba) and emphasizing risk-sharing rather than guaranteed returns, offer alternatives to conventional financial systems that many argue contributed to recent economic crises. Jewish concepts of jubilee years that periodically redistributed land and forgave debts provide historical models for addressing wealth concentration.

Christian liberation theology movements across Latin America and elsewhere have demonstrated how spiritual commitment can motivate political action for economic justice, while Buddhist economics emphasizes sustainability and well-being over pure growth maximization.

The challenge involves developing contemporary applications of these traditional teachings that address modern economic realities while maintaining spiritual authenticity. How do ancient principles of economic justice apply to globalized markets, digital currencies, and automated production systems?

Interfaith approaches to economic justice could provide alternatives to both unrestrained capitalism and authoritarian socialism by drawing on diverse spiritual traditions' wisdom about balancing individual initiative with collective responsibility, material prosperity with spiritual development, and local community needs with global interdependence.

Gender, Sexuality, and Religious Evolution

Questions of gender equality and sexual orientation represent among the most challenging issues for contemporary interfaith dialogue, as different religious traditions hold widely varying positions on these matters based on scriptural interpretation, historical precedent, and cultural context.

Progressive religious movements within Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and other traditions are developing new theological approaches that affirm gender equality and LGBTQ + dignity while maintaining commitment to spiritual authority and community tradition. Conservative religious voices argue that such developments represent departures from authentic faith rather than legitimate evolution.

The challenge involves creating dialogue across these differences without requiring any tradition to abandon its core convictions while still protecting vulnerable individuals from discrimination and harm. Can religious communities maintain

traditional teachings about gender and sexuality while still participating constructively in pluralistic societies that protect diverse family structures and identity expressions?

Some approaches focus on distinguishing between religious freedom within communities and civil equality in broader society, allowing religious groups to maintain internal standards while supporting legal protections for all citizens. Others emphasize shared values such as human dignity, family commitment, and community care that transcend specific positions on contested issues.

These conversations prove particularly complex in international contexts where different societies are experiencing different phases of social change regarding gender and sexuality. Western assumptions about inevitable progress toward greater inclusion may not reflect lived realities in societies with different cultural trajectories and historical experiences.

Education, Media, and Interfaith Literacy

Developing widespread interfaith literacy requires fundamental changes in educational systems, media representation, and public discourse about religious diversity. Most educational curricula remain focused on single religious traditions or secular worldviews, providing minimal exposure to the diversity of human spiritual experience.

Effective interfaith education begins with developing accurate, respectful understanding of different religious traditions while avoiding both relativism that treats all truth claims as equally valid and exclusivism that dismisses other traditions as false or inferior. This requires sophisticated pedagogical approaches that can hold complexity without collapsing into simplistic equality or hierarchical ranking.

Media representation of religious diversity often relies on stereotypes and crisis-driven narratives that emphasize conflict over cooperation and extremism over mainstream practice. Developing more nuanced, representative portrayals of religious communities requires collaboration between media professionals and religious communities themselves.

Digital literacy becomes increasingly important as young people encounter religious diversity primarily through online platforms that may lack appropriate context or critical analysis tools. Educational institutions must develop curricula that prepare students to navigate religious diversity in digital environments while maintaining critical thinking skills and respect for authentic difference.

Public discourse about religion in pluralistic societies requires shared vocabularies and frameworks that enable productive conversation across worldview differences. This involves developing common understandings of concepts such as religious freedom, secularism, tolerance, and pluralism that can function effectively in diverse cultural contexts.

Health, Medicine, and Spiritual Care

Healthcare systems in pluralistic societies must navigate diverse religious and cultural approaches to illness, healing, death, and medical decision-making. Religious traditions often provide comprehensive frameworks for understanding health and illness that extend beyond purely biomedical models to include spiritual, emotional, and communal dimensions of wellbeing.

Traditional medical systems such as Ayurveda, Traditional Chinese Medicine, and indigenous healing practices integrate spiritual and physical healing in ways that challenge Western separation of religion and medicine. Contemporary complementary and alternative medicine movements often draw on these traditions while adapting them to modern clinical contexts.

End-of-life care presents particular challenges as different religious traditions maintain varying perspectives on death, afterlife, medical intervention, and family decision-making authority. Healthcare institutions must develop culturally competent approaches that respect religious diversity while maintaining professional medical standards.

Mental health treatment increasingly recognizes the importance of spiritual resources for psychological wellbeing, leading to growing integration of religious and spiritual approaches within mainstream therapeutic practice. This integration requires careful attention to professional boundaries while honoring diverse spiritual frameworks for understanding mental health and healing.

Interfaith chaplaincy programs in hospitals, hospices, and other healthcare settings provide models for how different religious traditions can collaborate to provide comprehensive spiritual care without compromising particular theological commitments or professional therapeutic standards.

Arts, Culture, and Interfaith Expression

Artistic and cultural expression provides unique opportunities for interfaith encounter that transcend intellectual dialogue to engage emotional, aesthetic, and spiritual dimensions of religious experience. Music, visual arts, literature, and performance can communicate across linguistic and cultural boundaries in ways that facilitate understanding and appreciation.

Sacred music traditions from different cultures often share structural similarities and emotional resonances that enable cross-cultural appreciation even when specific theological content differs. Interfaith musical collaborations can create new forms of artistic expression while honoring distinct traditional sources.

Architecture and sacred space design in pluralistic societies must balance respect for particular religious requirements with broader community accessibility and aesthetic integration. Multi-faith prayer spaces in airports, hospitals, and universities

provide practical models for how different religious needs can be accommodated within shared environments.

Literature and storytelling offer powerful means for sharing religious wisdom and experience across cultural boundaries. Contemporary writers from diverse religious backgrounds are creating works that explore interfaith themes while maintaining authentic connection to particular spiritual traditions.

Festival celebrations and cultural events provide opportunities for religious communities to share their traditions with broader publics while building relationships with neighbors from different backgrounds. These events can move beyond superficial cultural tourism toward meaningful encounter and appreciation.

Conclusion: Toward Covenantal Pluralism

The journey toward authentic covenantal pluralism requires fundamental transformation in how human societies understand diversity, identity, and community. Rather than simply tolerating difference or attempting to eliminate it through assimilation, covenantal pluralism envisions societies where diversity serves as a source of creative energy and mutual enrichment.

This vision requires moving beyond both secular individualism that atomizes community into competing preference groups and religious fundamentalism that reduces complex spiritual traditions into rigid identity markers. Instead, covenantal pluralism draws on the deepest wisdom of various religious traditions while creating space for ongoing spiritual evolution and cultural creativity.

The challenges facing contemporary civilization—climate change, economic inequality, technological disruption, demographic transformation—cannot be addressed effectively by any single nation, culture, or religious tradition acting alone. These challenges require unprecedented levels of cooperation across difference while maintaining the distinctive contributions that diverse communities bring to human flourishing.

Covenantal pluralism offers a framework for this cooperation by emphasizing mutual obligation and shared responsibility rather than merely individual rights or group competition. It recognizes that human dignity derives from both individual worth and communal belonging, requiring protection for both personal freedom and collective identity.

The future of human civilization may depend on our ability to develop forms of social organization that can accommodate unprecedented diversity while maintaining sufficient coherence to enable collective action on shared challenges. Religious traditions, with their accumulated wisdom about community formation, meaning-making, and ethical transformation, possess essential resources for this task.

However, these resources can only be accessed through genuine encounter across difference—the patient, humble work of building relationships, sharing stories, and discovering common ground while respecting authentic disagreement. This is the

work of interfaith dialogue and covenantal pluralism: not the elimination of difference but its transformation into a source of mutual blessing and shared flourishing.

The path forward requires both institutional innovation and spiritual transformation, both policy changes and personal conversion, both global cooperation and local community building. It demands the best of human wisdom from all traditions while remaining open to new insights and creative solutions that emerge from encounter across difference.

In a world where the forces of fragmentation and polarization seem ascendant, covenantal pluralism offers hope for alternative futures where diversity serves human flourishing rather than undermining it. This hope is not naive optimism but a commitment to the hard work of building beloved community across the boundaries that have historically divided human beings from one another.

The success of this vision will be measured not by the elimination of religious and cultural difference but by the transformation of how such differences function in human society—from sources of conflict and competition toward sources of wisdom, creativity, and mutual enrichment. This transformation represents both a practical necessity for human survival and a spiritual opportunity for realizing the deepest aspirations of our various religious traditions.

The work of covenantal pluralism is ultimately the work of love—love that transcends the boundaries of tribe and nation and tradition to embrace the full diversity of human experience while honoring the particular gifts that each community brings to our shared human future. In pursuing this work, we participate in the ancient human dream of societies where difference serves unity rather than undermining it, where the many contribute to the flourishing of the one without losing their distinctive identities and gifts.

This is the promise and challenge of covenantal pluralism: to create forms of human community worthy of our highest spiritual aspirations while capable of addressing our most pressing practical challenges. The future of religion and society may well depend on our willingness to embrace this challenge with both courage and humility, both vision and practical wisdom, both commitment to our own traditions and openness to the transformative encounters that await us across the boundaries of difference.

The work of covenantal pluralism is ultimately the work of love—love that transcends the boundaries of tribe and nation and tradition to embrace the full diversity of human experience while honoring the particular gifts that each community brings to our shared human future. In pursuing this work, we participate in the ancient human dream of societies where difference serves unity rather than undermining it, where the many contribute to the flourishing of the one without losing their distinctive identities and gifts.

This is the promise and challenge of covenantal pluralism: to create forms of human community worthy of our highest spiritual aspirations while capable of addressing our most pressing practical challenges. The future of religion and society may well depend on our willingness to embrace this challenge with both courage and humility, both vision and practical wisdom, both commitment to our own traditions

and openness to the transformative encounters that await us across the boundaries of difference.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

Chapter 4
Practical Theory

Introduction: Beyond Tolerance to Transformation

Covenantal pluralism represents more than an intellectual exercise or policy framework—it constitutes a fundamental reimagining of how diverse religious communities can engage with one another in ways that honor both difference and unity. Unlike mere tolerance, which maintains distance while accepting the existence of others, or assimilation, which eliminates difference through absorption into dominant cultures, covenantal pluralism seeks transformation through genuine encounter (Eck, 2001; Putnam, 2007). This approach recognizes that authentic pluralism cannot be taught through formal instruction alone but must emerge from experiential engagement that challenges existing worldviews and creates opportunities for mutual understanding (Patel, 2012; Prothero, 2010).

The concept of covenant, drawn from Abrahamic traditions but applicable across religious contexts, emphasizes mutual obligation and shared responsibility rather than individual rights or group competition (Elazar, 1995; Levenson, 1985). In this framework, diversity becomes not a problem to be managed but a resource to be cultivated for the benefit of all communities. This transformation requires moving beyond superficial multicultural celebrations toward deep engagement with the substantive differences and commonalities that characterize authentic religious diversity (Parekh, 2000; Taylor, 1994).

The Psychology of Pluralistic Transformation

One cannot be taught to be a pluralist through vocabulary acquisition or theoretical frameworks alone—authentic pluralistic consciousness requires more than formal instruction (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Engaging with pluralism constitutes an emotional and cognitive journey of self-discovery that typically begins

© The Author(s) 2026

I. Akhtar, *Covenantal Pluralism*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-31479-6_4

with some disruption to one's current worldview, a crack in existing certainties that creates openness to learning about others (Mezirow, 1991; Cranton, 2006).

For those genuinely open to the experience, creating controlled cognitive overload can help reset mental approaches to encountering difference (Aronson & Mills, 1959; Festinger, 1957). In interfaith contexts, this transformation often occurs during a Christian's first visit to a mosque, a Muslim's initial experience in a Hindu temple, or a Jewish person's participation in Buddhist meditation practice. These encounters provide what anthropologists call "liminal experiences"—threshold moments that suspend normal categories and create possibilities for new understanding (Turner, 1969; van Gennep, 1960).

The physical and sensory dimensions of such encounters prove crucial for their transformative potential. Seeing unfamiliar religious art, hearing different languages of prayer, smelling incense or other ritual elements, and observing devotional practices creates multisensory experiences that bypass purely intellectual processing and engage deeper levels of consciousness (Csordas, 1994; McGuire, 2008). These embodied encounters can be followed by sharing meals together as interfaith groups, which anchors the experience in both physical and communal dimensions of human connection.

Food functions as a universal social lubricant that facilitates connection through one of the most basic shared human experiences—eating together (Douglas, 1966; Lévi-Strauss, 1978). Across religious traditions, commensality carries profound spiritual and social significance, from Christian Eucharist to Sikh langar to Islamic iftar gatherings. When people from different faith backgrounds share meals, they participate in an ancient human ritual that transcends doctrinal differences while honoring the sacred dimensions of nourishment and hospitality (Albala, 2013; Counihan & Van Esterik, 2013).

The act of eating together creates temporary communities that can model possibilities for broader social cooperation. Dietary restrictions and food traditions become opportunities for learning rather than barriers to interaction, as participants navigate halal, kosher, vegetarian, and other requirements while discovering common ground in the universal human need for sustenance and fellowship (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1987; McWilliams, 2012).

Research in social psychology confirms that shared meals increase cooperation, trust, and positive attitudes across group boundaries, even among participants who begin with negative stereotypes about one another (Kessler & Cohrs, 2008; Woolley & Fishbach, 2017). These effects persist beyond the immediate encounter, creating foundation for ongoing relationship and dialogue.

Developing the courage to learn authentically about religious others often represents the most challenging aspect of pluralistic transformation (Bennett, 1993; Sue & Sue, 2015). For some individuals, simply clicking an internet link to read about another faith tradition constitutes a significant accomplishment that requires overcoming years of socialization toward religious exclusivity or secular dismissal of spiritual traditions.

Developmental psychology research indicates that cognitive path dependencies become increasingly entrenched with age, suggesting that pluralistic education

should ideally begin with young children during periods of maximum neuroplasticity and openness to new experiences (Kohlberg, 1981; Piaget, 1977). However, opportunities for transformation can emerge later in life, particularly among individuals for whom suffering connects to their identity as actual or perceived minorities (Fowler, 1981; Parks, 2000).

The experience of marginalization, persecution, or discrimination often creates cognitive and emotional conditions conducive to empathy with other marginalized groups (Allport, 1954; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Holocaust survivors who became civil rights activists, African American churches that supported immigrant rights, and LGBTQ + individuals who advocate for religious freedom exemplify how personal experience of otherness can motivate solidarity across difference.

Experienced pluralism practitioners employ strategic isolation techniques to reduce natural psychological defenses against engaging with difference (Amir, 1969; Cook, 1985). Groups of participants are temporarily removed from their daily routines and social contexts, either through intensive retreat experiences or regular meetings in neutral spaces, to build relationships across differences that enable authentic dialogue and mutual understanding.

This isolation serves multiple functions: it creates psychological safety for vulnerable self-disclosure, establishes new social norms of openness and acceptance, reduces the influence of external pressures and expectations, and allows time for gradual relationship development that might not occur in casual encounters (Deutsch & Collins, 1951; Wilner et al., 1955). The individual relationships that develop within these protected spaces become contextualized within new group dynamics and social norms that participants can internalize as part of their expanding identities.

Contemporary research on intergroup contact confirms that optimal conditions for positive attitude change include equal status contact between groups, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and support from authorities, laws, or customs (Dovidio et al., 2003; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Strategic isolation helps create these optimal conditions while minimizing potential negative effects of poorly structured contact.

Structural Barriers to Interfaith Engagement

Implementing comprehensive interfaith programming presents significant challenges for many communities, particularly in contexts where resources are limited and social pressures against such engagement are substantial (Bruce, 2003; Norris & Inglehart, 2004). Obtaining funding for sustained dialogue programs proves especially difficult in developing world contexts where basic social services remain underfunded and interfaith work may appear less urgent than immediate material needs (Sen, 1999; Sachs, 2005).

Beyond financial constraints, the reputational costs of engaging in interfaith dialogue can prove particularly problematic in communitarian societies where individual actions reflect on extended families and religious communities (Hofstede,

2001; Triandis, 1995). Participants may face criticism from co-religionists who view such engagement as betrayal, compromise of religious integrity, or dangerous exposure to potential conversion pressures.

These concerns are not entirely unfounded, as the history of interfaith engagement includes numerous examples of ulterior motives and manipulative practices disguised as dialogue (Sharpe, 1977; Race, 1983). Building authentic trust across religious boundaries requires addressing these legitimate concerns through transparent communication about goals, methods, and boundaries for engagement.

Throughout most of human history, religious pluralism was defined and maintained through different groups existing alongside each other without necessarily engaging in systematic dialogue or mutual learning (Berger, 1967; Smith, 1963). While individual relationships might have existed across faith boundaries, few broad attempts were made to systematically understand and engage with religious others as communities.

Traditional models of religious coexistence often involved parallel institutions, separate legal systems, and minimal interaction beyond necessary commercial or political arrangements (Cohen, 1994; Braude & Lewis, 1982). The Ottoman millet system, medieval Andalusian convivencia, and British colonial arrangements in India exemplify approaches that maintained order through separation rather than integration (Levy, 1994; Menocal, 2002).

Contemporary interfaith dialogue represents a significant paradigm shift that requires moving beyond these historical precedents toward active engagement and mutual understanding (Race, 2001; Forward, 2001). This transformation challenges not only external social arrangements but also internal psychological and theological assumptions about the nature of religious truth and community boundaries.

Interfaith dialogue typically begins among religious leaders and clergy before expanding to broader congregational participation (Wessels, 1994; Moyaert, 2012). This pattern reflects both the practical reality that clergy possess theological training necessary for navigating complex doctrinal differences and the institutional authority required to legitimize such engagement within their communities.

However, clergy-initiated dialogue faces particular challenges in traditions where religious authority is democratically distributed or where clerical hierarchies are viewed with suspicion (McBrien, 1994; Roof & McKinney, 1987). Protestant traditions that emphasize individual scriptural interpretation, Islamic communities that reject formal clergy, and Jewish movements that prioritize scholarly debate over hierarchical authority must develop alternative models for authorizing and structuring interfaith engagement.

Successful expansion from clergy to congregational participation requires careful attention to different levels of theological sophistication, varying comfort with doctrinal ambiguity, and diverse motivations for participating in interfaith activities (Ammerman et al., 1998; Warner, 1993). Educational programs must accommodate both those seeking intellectual understanding and those motivated primarily by social relationships or community service opportunities.

Both Christianity and Islam—together representing nearly 60% of the world's population—maintain exclusivist theological positions that create inherent tensions

for interfaith dialogue (Hick, 1989; D'Costa, 1986). While these traditions may acknowledge that religious others can achieve salvation or divine favor, they fundamentally assert that ultimate truth and complete salvation come through their own revelations and that rejection of their central messages results in eternal spiritual consequences.

These exclusivist claims are not merely abstract theological positions but constitute core elements of religious identity and community membership for many believers (Lindbeck, 1984; McGrath, 1996). For evangelical Christians, the Great Commission mandating worldwide evangelization represents a fundamental religious obligation that appears to conflict with dialogue approaches that bracket proselytizing concerns (Bosch, 1991; Bevans & Schroeder, 2004).

Similarly, Islamic concepts of da'wa (invitation to faith) and the understanding of Islam as the final revelation that completes and corrects previous monotheistic traditions create theological tensions with pluralistic approaches that treat all religions as equally valid paths to truth (Esposito, 1988; Nasr, 1996). The historical context of Christian missionary activity in Muslim societies has made many Muslim communities particularly suspicious of interfaith initiatives that might serve as vehicles for disguised evangelization (Bulliet, 1994; Lewis, 1995).

If one's faith represents absolute divine truth, what intellectual or spiritual purpose is served by learning about religious traditions understood to contain fundamental errors or incomplete revelations? This question reflects a deeper epistemological challenge that affects not only exclusivist traditions but also religious perspectives that maintain strong truth claims while remaining open to dialogue (Griffiths, 1991; Netland, 2001).

For many religious believers, faith operates in binary terms—truth or falsehood, salvation or damnation, authentic revelation or human invention—making it difficult to conceive how perspectives within different faith traditions could simultaneously contain validity (Plantinga, 2000; Alston, 1991). Individuals who have lived primarily within monocultural religious environments may lack experiential frameworks for understanding how genuine spiritual insight might emerge from unfamiliar theological systems or ritual practices.

The character trait of theological humility proves essential for navigating these challenges, enabling believers to recognize their finite human capacity for comprehending infinite divine reality (Meador, 2006; Worthington, 2007). This humility does not require abandoning truth claims but rather acknowledging that human understanding of divine truth remains incomplete and capable of expansion through encounter with others' spiritual experiences.

Indic traditions, particularly at their most sophisticated expressions, offer helpful models through concepts like the wheel metaphor in which various spokes lead to a single center (Radhakrishnan, 1940; Sharma, 1993). However, as with all religious traditions, Buddhism and Hinduism remain subject to chauvinistic tendencies and claims of superiority that demonstrate the psychological universality of viewing difference as inferiority (Sen, 2005; Nandy, 1983).

Historical Trauma and Emotional Healing

Much of interfaith work proves fundamentally psychological and emotional rather than purely intellectual, requiring attention to historical grievances and collective trauma that shape contemporary interreligious relationships (Volkan, 1997; Bar-Tal, 2007). Past trauma—whether historical persecution, colonial domination, religious warfare, or systematic discrimination—must be acknowledged and addressed before meaningful dialogue can proceed (Herman, 1992; Alexander, 2004).

The failure to address historical wounds often results in surface-level interactions that avoid substantive engagement with the actual sources of mistrust and resentment between communities (Lederach, 1997; Appleby, 2000). Successful interfaith initiatives increasingly incorporate elements of truth-telling, acknowledgment of harm, and reconciliation processes adapted from post-conflict societies and restorative justice programs (Villa-Vicencio & Verwoerd, 2000; Zehr, 2002).

This emphasis on emotional and psychological dimensions helps explain why the most effective interfaith practitioners are often community leaders rather than academic scholars of religion (Patel, 2007; Putnam, 2000). While theological expertise remains important, the ability to understand and navigate the psychological dynamics of intergroup relations proves more crucial for creating transformative encounters.

One significant barrier to interfaith engagement involves the perception within religious communities of individuals who participate in dialogue with groups considered adversarial or threatening (Brewer, 1999; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). The reputational impact of being seen associating with "the enemy" can result in social ostracism, loss of religious authority, or questioning of one's fundamental loyalty to community values and interests.

The near-complete collapse of Jewish-Muslim interfaith dialogue in much of the Western world following the October 2023 Gaza conflict illustrates how external political events can overwhelm years of relationship-building and mutual understanding (Brettschneider, 2005; Saban, 2020). The characterization of interfaith dialogue as "faith-washing"—superficial engagement that obscures rather than addresses fundamental injustices—reflects deeper challenges in distinguishing between religious identity and political alignment.

This conflation becomes particularly problematic when it holds American Jews responsible for Israeli government policies or American Muslims accountable for actions by extremist groups, creating collective guilt that contradicts principles of individual responsibility and religious freedom (Goldberg, 1996; Esposito, 2002). The inability to differentiate between Israel's right to exist as a state and support for particular governmental policies represents a failure of nuanced thinking that undermines possibilities for constructive dialogue.

Such dynamics illustrate how interfaith engagement exists within broader political and social contexts that can either support or undermine dialogical efforts (Huntington, 1996; Norris, 2005). Successful programs must develop strategies for maintaining relationship and communication even during periods of heightened intergroup tension and political conflict.

Strategic Approaches to Pluralistic Education

Before embarking on dialogue programs, careful consideration must be given to specific end goals beyond generalized community well-being and strategies for maintaining momentum after formal programming concludes (Kirkpatrick, 1998; Stufflebeam, 2001). The desire to promote understanding and reduce prejudice, while laudable, cannot alone sustain long-term engagement without more concrete objectives and institutional support structures.

Research on diversity programs in workplace contexts reveals that poorly designed interventions can actually increase hostility toward diversity among majority group members, particularly when programs are perceived as mandatory, blame-oriented, or dismissive of legitimate concerns (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016; Bezrukova et al., 2012). One-day diversity workshops often fail to produce lasting change and may generate backlash when participants process their experiences within unsupportive social environments.

These findings suggest that interfaith interventions require supportive community networks capable of reinforcing and extending initial positive experiences (Putnam, 2000; Coleman, 1990). Isolated individuals who participate in dialogue programs but return to homogeneous social environments may struggle to maintain newfound appreciation for religious diversity without ongoing reinforcement and opportunities for continued engagement.

Effective pluralistic education creates new social networks that can sustain participants' evolving understanding of religious diversity beyond formal programming periods (Granovetter, 1973; Burt, 2005). These networks function as interpretive communities that provide alternative frameworks for understanding religious difference and ongoing relationships that reinforce pluralistic values and practices.

However, the formation of such networks can paradoxically create new forms of exclusion, as pluralistically-oriented religious individuals may find themselves alienated from co-religionists who maintain more traditional or exclusivist perspectives (McPherson et al., 2001; Marsden, 1987). This dynamic is particularly evident in conservative religious reactions to LGBTQ+ inclusion, where interfaith cooperation on social justice issues creates solidarity against traditional religious teachings on sexuality and gender.

The challenge involves creating inclusive approaches that honor both progressive and traditional religious perspectives while maintaining commitment to human dignity and equal treatment (Hunter, 1991; Putnam & Campbell, 2010). This requires sophisticated understanding of how different religious communities balance

innovation and tradition, individual conscience and communal authority, universal principles and particular practices.

The Transformative Power of Perspective-Taking

Pluralism, at its core, concerns perspective-taking—the capacity to understand how individuals experience and interpret faith through their personal life experiences, which may not conform to textbook definitions or official denominational teachings (Batson et al., 1993; Davis, 1994). This experiential dimension of religion often proves more significant for individual believers than abstract theological formulations or institutional doctrines.

Religious identity formation occurs through complex interactions between inherited traditions, personal experiences, social contexts, and individual psychological needs (Marcia, 1980; Berzonsky, 1990). Understanding someone as belonging to a religious community means recognizing that certain symbolic terms and practices are central to their self-identity, but the practical meaning and personal significance of these elements can vary dramatically across individuals and contexts.

Being Christian in Uganda involves different challenges, opportunities, and cultural expressions than being Christian in Utah, just as being Muslim in Indonesia differs substantially from being Muslim in Bosnia or Senegal (Hefner, 2000; Bowen, 2003). These variations reflect not merely superficial cultural adaptations but fundamental differences in how universal religious principles interact with particular historical, social, and political circumstances.

While religious faith can provide uplift and occasions for joyous celebration, the most profound bonds of interfaith connection often emerge through shared experiences of tragedy, persecution, or injustice (Wuthnow, 1991; McRoberts, 2003). Seeing the world from different religious perspectives requires and produces empathy and compassion for others' experiences of suffering and marginalization.

The civil rights movement in the United States exemplified how shared commitment to justice could unite religious communities across significant theological differences, as Black churches, liberal Protestant denominations, Catholic organizations, Jewish groups, and secular humanists found common cause in opposing racial segregation and discrimination (Branch, 1988; Chappell, 2004). Similar coalitions have emerged around issues of economic justice, immigrant rights, environmental protection, and opposition to religious persecution.

These alliances demonstrate how engagement with concrete social problems can create foundations for broader interfaith understanding and cooperation (Putnam & Campbell, 2010; Wald et al., 2005). When religious communities work together to address human suffering, they often discover shared values and commitments that transcend doctrinal differences while maintaining respect for particular theological perspectives.

Interfaith dialogue can enable participants to adopt secularized versions of faith traditions' conceptions of reality, treating religion as a collection of symbols, stories,

and practices that can be shared and incorporated into others' understanding of the world (Bellah, 1967; Luckmann, 1967). This approach provides vocabulary for discussing experiences and practices that facilitates conversation among believers and nonbelievers while bracketing ultimate truth claims.

The global adoption of terms like "karma" and "yoga" illustrates how religious concepts can migrate across cultural boundaries and acquire new meanings in different contexts (Singleton, 2010; Williamson, 2010). Originally, karma connected to Hindu and Buddhist concepts of rebirth and cosmic justice across multiple lifetimes, but in Anglophone secular contexts, it is understood as occurring within single lifetimes in the material world.

Similarly, yoga as physical practice has been largely separated from its original Hindu spiritual framework while simultaneously influencing modern practice in India as Western adaptations have returned to their homeland (Alter, 2004; De Michelis, 2004). This cultural circulation demonstrates both the adaptability of religious practices and the complex dynamics of globalization, appropriation, and transformation.

Narrative, Memory, and Religious Imagination

The most significant outcome of authentic interfaith dialogue often involves collaborative meaning-making through the sharing and reinterpretation of foundational stories (Ricoeur, 1984; McAdams, 1993). As populations have been converted to Christianity and Islam throughout history, older narratives were incorporated into new religious frameworks—pagan goddesses becoming reified in Catholic Marian traditions, local spirits being reconceptualized as saints or demons, and indigenous wisdom being integrated into missionary Christianity (Brown, 1981; Pelikan, 1985).

Interfaith dialogue encompasses both personal narratives and collective religious stories, creating opportunities for communities to discover unexpected connections and shared themes across apparent differences (White & Epston, 1990; Freedman & Combs, 1996). The religious imagination possesses capacity for infinite expansion, as illustrated by Buddhist realms typified in Pure Land traditions that envision multiple worlds and alternative realities (Williams, 1989; Hirota, 1997).

Within Abrahamic vernacular traditions, stories of prophets and patriarchs overlap significantly, though they are interpreted differently across Jewish, Christian, and Islamic contexts (Kugel, 1998; Firestone, 2001). These shared narrative foundations were constantly in dialogue with one another throughout medieval and early modern periods, creating rich traditions of comparative interpretation and mutual influence.

Each Abrahamic tradition highlights different aspects of Abraham's story according to their particular theological emphases and historical circumstances (Levenson, 2012; Siker, 1991). Judaism emphasizes Abraham's discovery of monotheism and his covenant with God establishing the Jewish people. Christianity focuses on Abraham's faith and his status as spiritual father of all believers. Islam

presents Abraham (Ibrahim) as the pure monotheist (hanif) who built the Kaaba and established the pilgrimage traditions.

These different emphases—from the refusal of idolatry to the commanded sacrifice of his son—demonstrate how shared narratives can serve diverse theological purposes while maintaining recognizable common elements (Levenson, 1993; Moberly, 2009). The traditions also generated extensive apocryphal literature, such as the Book of Jubilees and various Books of Noah, that helped ground contemporary communities in continuity with sacred past while addressing current concerns and challenges.

This pattern of continuity and innovation, rather than rupture and wholesale replacement, characterizes the authority and practice of world religions across historical periods (Brown, 1988; Cameron, 1991). Religious traditions must remain grounded in authoritative pasts to provide meaning across multiple generations while creating foundations upon which changes can be understood, evaluated, and implemented.

Stories can also exacerbate tensions and legitimize violence against religious others, particularly when they emphasize victory of one's own saints or heroes over representatives of other traditions (Appleby, 2000; Juergensmeyer, 2003). The greatest religious tensions often occur within faith traditions rather than between them, as theological disagreements about interpretation and practice become invested with ultimate significance and existential urgency.

Historical examples abound: Christians in Western Europe fought Eastern Christians during the Crusades; bloody European wars of religion pitted Catholics against Protestants; and the vast majority of victims of contemporary Muslim militant extremism have been Muslims themselves (Riley-Smith, 2008; Gregory, 2012; Hegghammer, 2010). These patterns suggest that proximity and similarity can generate more intense conflict than distant difference, as minor variations become magnified into fundamental threats to religious integrity.

Contemporary Hindu militant nationalism in India provides another illustration of how religious imagination can become politically weaponized, as historical mosques are destroyed in deference to mythological temples that may never have existed at those locations (Brass, 2003; Hansen, 1999). These actions demonstrate the fragility of pluralistic arrangements when religious narratives become fused with ethnic nationalism and political power.

Central religious texts function not merely as sources of information but as hermeneutical tools for ongoing meaning-making in response to changing circumstances and new challenges (Gadamer, 1975; Fish, 1980). The common interfaith discussion response "Look it up, it's in the Bible" reflects misunderstanding of how religious texts actually function within believing communities and scholarly interpretation.

What biblical, Quranic, or other scriptural texts "say" and how they should be interpreted have been subjects of intensive study for millennia, with reading communities bringing their own experiences, concerns, and questions to textual interpretation (Fishbane, 1985; Stern, 1988). People read their contemporary experiences

into ancient texts to find greater meaning, comfort, guidance, and connection to transcendent realities that extend beyond immediate circumstances.

This interpretive process requires both grounding in traditional methods of textual analysis and openness to new insights that emerge from encounter with different reading communities and alternative hermeneutical approaches (Schneiders, 1991; Thistleton, 1992). Interfaith dialogue can expose participants to unfamiliar ways of reading familiar texts or introduce them to entirely different scriptural traditions that illuminate aspects of their own religious inheritance.

The goal involves making inelastic stories into elastic dreams that, for most religious traditions, echo their truest understanding of faith as pointing toward ultimate unity beyond apparent diversity (Smart, 1996; Hick, 1989). This does not require abandoning particular truth claims but rather recognizing how those claims might connect to broader patterns of spiritual insight and divine revelation.

Covenantal Pluralism as Future Vision

Covenantal pluralism transcends merely correcting current problems in globalized interfaith relations to envision genuinely transformative possibilities for human community (Levinas, 1969; Sacks, 2002). Rather than settling for damage control or conflict management, this approach reaches into the past to recover the best insights from various traditions and civilizations, harnessing intellectual, cultural, and spiritual resources to create better futures for all communities.

This future orientation distinguishes covenantal pluralism from both nostalgic attempts to return to idealized past arrangements and pragmatic accommodation that accepts existing power structures as unchangeable (Cone, 1997; Gutierrez, 1973). Instead, it draws on prophetic traditions that envision radical transformation of social relationships based on justice, compassion, and mutual flourishing.

The spiritual imagination at its most expansive enables transcendence of zero-sum material competition through recognition of the illusory nature of unrestrained ego-drives for control and domination (Merton, 1961; Keating, 1994). These insights appear across religious traditions in various forms, from Buddhist teachings on the emptiness of separate self to Christian mystical traditions emphasizing union with divine love to Islamic Sufi understanding of the unity of existence.

The 1994 Rwandan genocide provides a particularly compelling example of how distorted understanding, hate speech, and wrong action can lead to incomprehensible destruction, while also demonstrating possibilities for healing through right livelihood, effort, mindfulness, and concentration (Gourevitch, 1998; Hatzfeld, 2005). Rwanda's subsequent emphasis on unity and reconciliation, while imperfect and contested, illustrates how societies can choose transformation over perpetual revenge.

Buddhist frameworks for understanding the relationship between mental states and social reality prove particularly relevant for analyzing cycles of violence and possibilities for breaking them (Thich Nhat Hanh, 1987; Sulak Sivaraksa, 1992). When incorrect understanding and thought lead to hate speech and discriminatory

action, the results inevitably involve suffering for all involved communities. Healing requires fundamental shifts in perception, intention, and practice that address root causes rather than merely symptoms.

This analysis applies not only to extreme cases like genocide but also to more routine forms of prejudice, discrimination, and intergroup hostility that characterize many contemporary societies (Allport, 1954; Dovidio et al., 2010). Addressing these issues requires sustained attention to both individual transformation and structural change in ways that honor religious wisdom while engaging practical political and economic realities.

Case Study: Muslim-Jewish Relations

The history of Muslim-Jewish relations before the modern era was predominantly characterized by cooperation and mutual influence rather than conflict and hostility (Lewis, 1984; Stillman, 1979). One of Judaism's greatest philosophers, Moses Maimonides (known as the Rambam), engaged extensively with Islamic thought and developed his systematic approach to Jewish theology through dialogue with Muslim contemporaries like Averroes and Avicenna (Kraemer, 2008; Davidson, 2005).

Similarly, early Islamic tradition drew heavily upon Jewish legal methodologies, exegetical approaches, and narrative traditions (Newby, 1988; Firestone, 1990). Much of the early explanation of Quranic narratives about biblical prophets utilized Jewish interpretive texts, including Torah and especially Talmudic sources that provided detailed elaboration of scriptural stories (Schwarzbaum, 1982; Adang, 1996).

Both religions developed sophisticated legal systems governing dietary practices, ritual observance, commercial relations, and family life that shared common concerns and often reached similar conclusions through different reasoning processes (Goitein, 1967–1993; Bulliet, 1994). These practical similarities, combined with shared monotheistic theology and understanding of religion as comprehensive way of life, made the Islamic world the logical home for the majority of the world's Jewish population until the modern period.

The development of Judeo-Arabic as both spoken language and intellectual tradition provides crucial insight for rethinking historical relationships between Judaism and Islam and between Jewish and Arab modern identities (Blau, 1965; Hary, 1992). Contemporary Middle Eastern conflicts have made the concept of Jewish Arab identity seem incomprehensible, yet some of the greatest poets writing in Arabic were Jews who contributed significantly to Islamic civilization while maintaining Jewish religious identity.

This historical synthesis challenges contemporary assumptions about the incompatibility of Jewish and Arab identities that have been shaped primarily by the Palestinian-Israeli conflict (Shohat, 1999; Alcalay, 1993). The reduction of complex civilizational relationships to territorial and political disputes represents a profound impoverishment of possibilities for cultural and religious cooperation.

To the great detriment of broader Arab development, the Palestinian issue—fundamentally a secular territorial dispute—was adopted by the globalizing Muslim world of the late twentieth century as a pan-Islamic religious cause (Khalidi, 1997; Massad, 2006). This transformation of a political conflict into religious identity marker has created false alignments that obscure possibilities for Jewish-Muslim cooperation on shared concerns like social justice, environmental protection, and economic development.

Jewish-Muslim interfaith work should focus on drawing the best insights from shared historical experience to innovate better futures together, preparing for "the day after the last bullet is fired" in current conflicts (Firestone, 2001; Reuven, 2014). As intractable as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict may appear, historical perspective suggests that all conflicts eventually end, and groundwork for better relationships must be established during periods of tension rather than waiting for political resolution.

The multicultural financial centers of both West (Miami, New York) and East (Dubai, Singapore) provide optimal settings for such bridge-building activities, where affluent and integrated minority communities can create neutral spaces and draw from diverse local cultures to envision more just and peaceful arrangements (Sassen, 2001; Ong, 1999). These cosmopolitan environments offer sufficient distance from immediate conflict zones to enable constructive dialogue while providing resources and networks necessary for sustained engagement.

Simple acts like Muslims and Jews sharing meals while discussing climate change concerns would be recognized as acts of worship within Islamic tradition: "Honor the near and far neighbor…without pride and arrogance" (Quran 4:36). Such everyday cooperation demonstrates how religious values can motivate practical collaboration while transcending political divisions that may seem insurmountable at governmental levels.

Challenges and Opportunities in Global Context

Contemporary interfaith dialogue increasingly occurs through digital platforms that transcend geographical boundaries while creating new challenges for authentic relationship-building (Campbell, 2012; Hoover & Echchaibi, 2014). Social media enables religious communities to connect across traditional cultural and national boundaries, creating global networks of shared identity and solidarity that can either support pluralistic engagement or reinforce exclusivist attitudes.

The democratization of religious authority through digital platforms has enabled both progressive interfaith initiatives and extremist recruitment efforts that exploit religious symbols and narratives for political purposes (Bunt, 2009; Anderson, 2015). Online environments can facilitate exposure to diverse religious perspectives while

also enabling the creation of echo chambers that reinforce existing prejudices and stereotypes.

Successful digital interfaith engagement requires careful attention to platform design, moderation practices, and community guidelines that encourage constructive dialogue while preventing exploitation by bad actors (Cheong et al., 2012; Fischer-Nielsen, 2012). Virtual reality and augmented reality technologies may soon enable more immersive interfaith experiences that combine the accessibility of digital engagement with embodied elements crucial for transformative encounter.

Environmental degradation and climate change provide unprecedented opportunities for interfaith cooperation around shared concerns that transcend traditional theological boundaries (Tucker & Grim, 2001; Gottlieb, 2006). Religious traditions possess rich resources for understanding human relationships with natural systems and motivating sustainable practices that purely secular environmentalism often lacks.

Indigenous traditions maintain sophisticated ecological knowledge and spiritual practices that view environmental stewardship as sacred responsibility rather than optional preference (Berkes, 2012; Kimmerer, 2013). Buddhist concepts of interdependence provide frameworks for understanding how individual actions connect to global consequences, while Islamic principles of stewardship (khalifa) emphasize human responsibility for protecting creation as divine trust (Nasr, 1996; Foltz et al., 2003).

Christian traditions are rediscovering creation theology that views environmental care as fundamental expression of faith rather than peripheral concern (White, 1967; McDaniel, 1989). Hindu concepts of ahimsa (non-violence) extend to relationships with all living beings, providing ethical foundations for sustainable living practices that challenge consumerist assumptions about human-nature relationships (Chapple, 1993; Nelson, 1998).

Interfaith environmental initiatives are emerging worldwide, from Buddhist-Christian collaborations on renewable energy projects to Muslim-Jewish partnerships on sustainable agriculture (Palmer & Finlay, 2003; Gardner, 2006). These cooperations demonstrate how shared concern for planetary survival can transcend theological differences while creating practical foundations for ongoing relationship and mutual understanding.

Contemporary global economic inequalities challenge religious communities to articulate and implement visions of economic justice rooted in spiritual values rather than purely secular political ideologies (Stackhouse et al., 1995; Finn, 2013). Most religious traditions contain sophisticated teachings about wealth distribution, economic ethics, and responsibilities toward the poor and marginalized that could inform alternative approaches to global development.

Islamic banking principles prohibiting usury (riba) and emphasizing risk-sharing rather than guaranteed returns offer alternatives to conventional financial systems that many argue contributed to recent economic crises (El-Gamal, 2006; Iqbal & Mirakhor, 2011). Jewish concepts of jubilee years that periodically redistributed land and forgave debts provide historical models for addressing wealth concentration and systemic inequality (Leviticus 25; Meeks, 1989).

Christian liberation theology movements across Latin America and elsewhere have demonstrated how spiritual commitment can motivate political action for economic justice, while Buddhist economics emphasizes sustainability and well-being over pure growth maximization (Gutierrez, 1973; Schumacher, 1973). These alternatives challenge both unrestrained capitalism and authoritarian socialism by drawing on diverse spiritual traditions' wisdom about balancing individual initiative with collective responsibility.

The challenge involves developing contemporary applications of these traditional teachings that address modern economic realities—globalized markets, digital currencies, automated production systems—while maintaining spiritual authenticity and practical effectiveness (Novak, 1982; Atherton, 2008). Interfaith approaches to economic justice could provide alternatives that transcend conventional left–right political divisions by grounding policy discussions in shared spiritual values.

Climate change, political instability, and economic inequality are creating unprecedented levels of human migration and displacement that challenge traditional concepts of national belonging and religious community (Castles et al., 2013; Betts, 2013). Religious traditions possess rich resources for addressing these challenges through concepts of hospitality, sanctuary, and welcome to strangers that could inform more humane approaches to immigration policy.

The biblical injunction to "welcome the stranger" appears across Abrahamic traditions, while Buddhist compassion and Hindu concepts of divine presence in all beings provide alternative frameworks for understanding moral obligations to displaced persons (Pohl, 1999; Groody & Campese, 2008). These religious resources offer alternatives to purely secular human rights discourse that may lack cultural resonance in traditional societies.

Interfaith cooperation on refugee resettlement, immigrant integration, and advocacy for comprehensive immigration reform demonstrates how shared values can motivate concrete action while building relationships across religious boundaries (Eby et al., 2011; Foley & Hoge, 2007). These partnerships often reveal unexpected commonalities between communities that may appear theologically distant but share similar experiences of migration, marginalization, or persecution.

Educational Strategies and Institutional Development

Effective interfaith education requires sophisticated pedagogical approaches that can engage participants at multiple levels—intellectual, emotional, spiritual, and practical—while accommodating diverse learning styles and educational backgrounds (Banks, 2004; Nieto, 2010). Traditional classroom models that emphasize information transmission prove inadequate for the transformative goals of authentic pluralistic education.

Experiential learning approaches that incorporate site visits, service projects, artistic expression, and contemplative practices prove more effective for creating lasting attitude change and relationship development (Kolb, 1984; Palmer, 1998).

These methods engage embodied dimensions of religious experience while providing safe structures for encountering difference and processing emotional reactions.

Narrative approaches that encourage participants to share personal stories of faith, doubt, transformation, and identity formation create opportunities for deep connection across apparent differences (McAdams, 2011; Atwood & Stolorow, 1984). When people understand how others have struggled with similar existential questions—meaning, suffering, hope, death—they often discover commonalities that transcend doctrinal disagreements.

Case study methodologies adapted from business and policy education can help participants analyze complex interfaith scenarios while developing practical skills for navigating religious diversity in professional and civic contexts (Christensen & Hansen, 1987; Boehrer & Linsky, 1990). These approaches prepare participants for real-world applications of interfaith competency beyond formal educational settings.

Measuring the effectiveness of interfaith education programs requires sophisticated assessment strategies that can capture both immediate learning outcomes and longer-term behavioral changes (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014; Patton, 2014). Traditional knowledge-based assessments prove inadequate for evaluating transformative experiences that involve attitude change, relationship development, and spiritual growth.

Portfolio approaches that document participants' reflective writing, artistic expression, and project-based learning provide more comprehensive evidence of growth and development (Wolf & Dietz, 1998; Simon & Forgette-Giroux, 2000). These methods honor diverse ways of processing and expressing learning while creating artifacts that can be shared and evaluated by multiple stakeholders.

Longitudinal studies that track participants' attitudes, behaviors, and relationships over extended periods provide crucial evidence about the lasting impact of interfaith education (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Dovidio et al., 2003). These research designs can identify which program elements prove most effective for different populations while revealing unexpected outcomes that may emerge months or years after formal programming ends.

Community-based participatory research approaches that involve religious communities as partners in evaluation design and implementation help ensure that assessment strategies reflect diverse values and priorities while building capacity for ongoing program improvement (Israel et al., 2012; Wallerstein et al., 2017).

Sustainable interfaith education requires institutional partnerships that can provide ongoing support, resources, and legitimacy for pluralistic initiatives (Austin, 2000; Bryson et al., 2006). Universities, religious institutions, community organizations, and government agencies each bring different strengths and limitations to collaborative efforts.

Academic institutions offer research expertise, educational resources, and neutral venues for interfaith programming while often lacking deep community connections and practical implementation experience (Jacobsen & Jacobsen, 2008; Cady & Brown, 2002). Religious organizations provide theological authority and community access while potentially limiting participation to those already committed to their particular traditions.

Community-based organizations offer grassroots connections and practical experience with social justice issues while often lacking resources for comprehensive programming (Putnam, 2000; Skocpol, 2003). Government agencies can provide funding and policy support while raising concerns about religious establishment and political manipulation of faith communities.

Successful partnerships require clear agreements about roles, responsibilities, and boundaries that respect each partner's distinctive contributions while maintaining shared commitment to pluralistic goals (Hardy et al., 2003; Huxham & Vangen, 2005). These arrangements must balance accountability with flexibility, allowing for adaptation and learning while maintaining program integrity and effectiveness.

Theological and Philosophical Foundations

Covenantal pluralism raises fundamental questions about the nature of religious authority and the relationship between revelation and reason that different faith traditions answer in various ways (McGrath, 2001; Plantinga, 2000). How can communities maintain commitment to particular truth claims while remaining open to insights from other traditions? What constitutes legitimate religious innovation versus unacceptable compromise or syncretism?

These questions prove particularly challenging for traditions that emphasize scriptural authority, apostolic succession, or prophetic finality as foundations for religious legitimacy (Lindbeck, 1984; Frei, 1974). Yet even the most traditionalist religious communities have historically adapted their interpretations and practices in response to changing circumstances while maintaining claims to continuity with foundational authorities.

The concept of progressive revelation suggests that divine truth unfolds gradually through history, allowing for new insights that complement rather than contradict previous revelations (Swidler, 1987; Hick, 1989). This framework enables religious communities to remain open to learning from others while maintaining confidence in their own traditions' validity and significance.

Alternative approaches emphasize the distinction between core spiritual insights and particular cultural expressions, allowing for translation and adaptation of religious wisdom across different contexts while preserving essential meanings (Panikkar, 1979; Tracy, 1987). These perspectives enable interfaith dialogue without requiring abandonment of distinctive religious commitments.

One of the most persistent challenges in interfaith theology involves balancing universal spiritual insights with particular cultural and historical expressions of religious truth (Otto, 1923; Eliade, 1957). How can religious communities maintain their distinctive identities and practices while acknowledging the validity of other paths to spiritual realization?

Exclusivist positions maintain that only one tradition possesses complete truth and authentic means of salvation, making dialogue primarily an opportunity for witness and conversion rather than mutual learning (Netland, 2001; Carson, 1996). Inclusivist

approaches acknowledge that other traditions may contain genuine spiritual insights while maintaining that one's own tradition provides the fullest or most complete revelation of divine truth (Race, 1983; D'Costa, 1986).

Pluralist theologies argue that different religious traditions represent alternative but equally valid paths to ultimate reality, each contributing distinctive insights to human understanding of the divine (Hick, 1989; Knitter, 1985). Particularist positions emphasize the irreducible differences between religious traditions while maintaining that dialogue can enhance understanding without requiring theological convergence (Lindbeck, 1984; Milbank, 1990).

Covenantal pluralism attempts to transcend these traditional categories by focusing on practical cooperation and mutual responsibility rather than theoretical questions about ultimate truth (Sacks, 2002; Levinas, 1969). This approach enables communities to work together on shared concerns while maintaining their distinctive theological commitments and spiritual practices.

Different approaches to scriptural interpretation significantly influence possibilities for interfaith dialogue and cooperation (Gadamer, 1975; Ricoeur, 1981). Fundamentalist approaches that emphasize literal interpretation and divine dictation of sacred texts often generate resistance to dialogue that might relativize absolute truth claims (Marty & Appleby, 1991–1995; Almond et al., 2003).

Historical–critical methods that examine the historical contexts and literary development of religious texts can illuminate commonalities between traditions while potentially undermining claims to divine authorship or textual infallibility (Collins, 2005; Barton, 2007). These approaches may increase scholarly appreciation for interfaith connections while creating tensions with traditional believers who maintain devotional approaches to scripture.

Canonical approaches that emphasize the authoritative status of scriptural collections within particular religious communities can support interfaith dialogue by acknowledging that different communities may legitimately interpret similar texts in different ways (Childs, 1979; Sanders, 1987). This perspective respects religious authority while creating space for learning from alternative interpretive traditions.

Reader-response approaches that emphasize the role of interpretive communities in creating textual meaning can support pluralistic engagement by highlighting how religious texts speak differently to different communities while maintaining their capacity to generate genuine spiritual insight (Fish, 1980; Iser, 1978). These methods honor both textual authority and interpretive creativity.

Practical Applications and Case Studies

Contemporary workplaces increasingly require employees to navigate religious diversity in ways that maintain professional relationships while respecting different faith commitments and practices (Hicks, 2003; Miller, 2007). Issues arise around holiday scheduling, prayer accommodations, dietary restrictions, dress codes, and

religious expression that require sophisticated understanding of legal requirements and interpersonal dynamics.

Successful workplace religious diversity programs combine legal compliance training with relationship-building activities that help employees understand and appreciate different faith traditions (Pfeffer, 2010; Karakas, 2010). These initiatives often reveal how workplace conflicts attributed to religious differences actually involve broader issues of communication, respect, and inclusion that affect all employees.

Employee resource groups organized around shared religious identities can provide support networks and advocacy platforms while potentially creating new forms of workplace segregation if not carefully designed (Friedman & Craig, 2004; Catalyst, 2001). The most effective programs balance affinity group development with cross-religious relationship building and alliance formation.

Chaplaincy programs in large corporations and institutions provide spiritual care resources while raising questions about religious establishment and equal treatment of different faith traditions (Wintz, 2007; Kaplan, 2002). These services must navigate between providing authentic spiritual support and maintaining professional boundaries in secular work environments.

Healthcare systems in pluralistic societies must accommodate diverse religious and cultural approaches to illness, healing, death, and medical decision-making (Koenig et al., 2012; Puchalski & Ferrell, 2010). Religious traditions often provide comprehensive frameworks for understanding health and illness that extend beyond biomedical models to include spiritual, emotional, and communal dimensions of wellbeing.

Traditional medical systems such as Ayurveda, Traditional Chinese Medicine, and indigenous healing practices integrate spiritual and physical healing in ways that challenge Western separation of religion and medicine (Kleinman, 1980; Lock & Gordon, 1988). Contemporary complementary and alternative medicine movements often draw on these traditions while adapting them to modern clinical contexts.

End-of-life care presents particular challenges as different religious traditions maintain varying perspectives on death, afterlife, medical intervention, and family decision-making authority (Braun et al., 2000; Searight & Gafford, 2005). Healthcare institutions must develop culturally competent approaches that respect religious diversity while maintaining professional medical standards and legal compliance.

Interfaith chaplaincy programs in hospitals, hospices, and other healthcare settings provide models for how different religious traditions can collaborate to provide comprehensive spiritual care without compromising particular theological commitments (VandeCreek & Burton, 2001; Carey & Cohen, 2008). These programs often serve as laboratories for developing interfaith cooperation models applicable in other institutional contexts.

Pluralistic societies must navigate complex relationships between secular legal systems and religious law traditions that claim divine authority and comprehensive jurisdiction over believers' lives (An-Na'im, 2008; Shachar, 2001). Issues arise around marriage and divorce, child custody, inheritance, commercial law, and

personal status matters where religious and secular authorities may reach different conclusions.

Some jurisdictions have developed accommodation systems that allow religious communities to apply their own laws in certain areas while maintaining state authority over criminal matters and fundamental rights (Bano, 2012; Shah, 2005). These arrangements attempt to balance religious freedom with equal citizenship rights while avoiding the creation of parallel legal systems that might undermine social cohesion.

Alternative dispute resolution mechanisms such as religious arbitration and mediation provide options for resolving conflicts according to religious principles while maintaining voluntary participation and basic procedural protections (Helfand, 2012; Broyde & Wolowelsky, 2005). These approaches can reduce court backlogs while respecting religious values and community relationships.

Constitutional frameworks for religious freedom must balance individual liberty with community autonomy while preventing the establishment of state religions or discrimination against religious minorities (McConnell, 1992; Witte & Alexander, 2008). These balancing acts require ongoing negotiation and interpretation as social conditions and religious demographics change over time.

Future Directions and Emerging Challenges

The rapid development of artificial intelligence and virtual reality technologies presents both opportunities and challenges for religious communities and interfaith relations (Campbell, 2016; Cheong et al., 2012). AI systems can provide personalized religious guidance, facilitate access to sacred texts and teachings, and enable new forms of spiritual practice and community connection.

However, these technologies also raise fundamental questions about the nature of authentic religious authority, the importance of embodied spiritual practice, and the role of human community in religious formation (Graham, 2009; Brasher, 2004). Can artificial intelligence provide genuine spiritual guidance, or does authentic religious wisdom require human insight and relationship?

Virtual reality environments may soon enable people to experience religious practices and sacred spaces from different traditions in unprecedented ways (Schroeder, 2008; Bailenson, 2018). Participants might visit virtual reconstructions of ancient temples, engage in guided meditation with AI spiritual teachers, or experience sacred texts through immersive storytelling technologies.

These developments raise profound questions about the relationship between virtual and authentic religious experience, the potential for digital religious tourism versus genuine spiritual encounter, and the implications of commercializing sacred traditions through technology platforms (Hoover, 2006; Campbell, 2020).

Economic globalization and cultural interconnection have paradoxically contributed to the rise of religious nationalism movements that reject pluralistic

engagement in favor of identity-based politics and cultural purification (Juergensmeyer, 1993; Bruce, 2003). These movements often employ religious symbols and narratives to legitimize exclusivist political agendas while rejecting traditional religious teachings about compassion, justice, and universal human dignity.

The challenge for interfaith dialogue involves distinguishing between authentic religious commitment and political manipulation of religious identity for nationalist purposes (Marty & Appleby, 1991–1995; Kedourie, 1992). Religious communities must develop capacity to resist co-optation by extremist movements while maintaining engagement with broader political and social issues that affect their members.

Global communication networks enable both progressive interfaith cooperation and extremist recruitment efforts that exploit religious grievances and identity conflicts (Bunt, 2009; Roy, 2004). The same technologies that facilitate positive interfaith engagement also enable the rapid spread of conspiracy theories, hate speech, and violent ideologies that undermine pluralistic values.

Effective responses require collaboration between religious leaders, technology companies, government agencies, and civil society organizations to develop strategies that protect religious freedom while preventing exploitation of religious communities by extremist movements (Stern & Berger, 2015; McCants, 2015).

Climate change presents unprecedented challenges that require unprecedented levels of global cooperation across religious, cultural, and political boundaries (McKibben, 2007; Klein, 2014). Religious communities possess unique resources for motivating individual behavior change and supporting policy initiatives that address environmental degradation while promoting social justice.

However, environmental cooperation also reveals tensions between different religious approaches to nature, technology, development, and human responsibility that must be navigated carefully to maintain interfaith partnerships (White, 1967; Nasr, 1996). Some traditions emphasize human stewardship and technological solutions, while others prioritize harmony with natural systems and limitations on consumption.

Climate-induced migration and resource scarcity are already generating conflicts that religious communities must address through cooperative initiatives for refugee assistance, conflict resolution, and sustainable development (Reuveny, 2007; Buhaug, 2015). These challenges require interfaith partnerships that can transcend national boundaries and political divisions while maintaining local community connections.

The urgency of environmental crisis may provide opportunities for breakthrough interfaith cooperation that moves beyond dialogue toward coordinated action on shared survival concerns (Gottlieb, 2006; Tucker & Grim, 2001). Success will require balancing immediate practical needs with longer-term relationship building and institutional development that can sustain cooperation beyond current crisis periods.

Conclusion: The Imperative of Covenantal Pluralism

The future of human civilization increasingly depends on our capacity to develop forms of social organization that can accommodate unprecedented religious and cultural diversity while maintaining sufficient coherence to enable collective action on shared challenges (Putnam, 2007; Appleby, 2000). Covenantal pluralism offers a framework for this crucial work by emphasizing mutual obligation and shared responsibility rather than merely individual rights or group competition.

This approach requires fundamental transformation in how we understand religious identity, political membership, and human community (Levinas, 1969; Sacks, 2002). Rather than viewing diversity as a problem to be managed or eliminated, covenantal pluralism treats difference as a resource to be cultivated for the benefit of all communities while honoring the particular gifts that each tradition brings to our common human future.

The practical work of building covenantal pluralism involves patient relationship building across religious boundaries, sustained dialogue that addresses both commonalities and genuine differences, collaborative action on shared concerns, and institutional innovation that can support diverse communities while maintaining social cohesion (Patel, 2007; Putnam, 2000). This work cannot be accomplished through government programs or academic initiatives alone but requires grassroots engagement by religious communities themselves.

Success will be measured not by the elimination of religious difference but by the transformation of how such differences function in human society—from sources of conflict and competition toward sources of wisdom, creativity, and mutual enrichment (Parekh, 2000; Taylor, 1994). This transformation represents both a practical necessity for human survival and a spiritual opportunity for realizing the deepest aspirations of our various religious traditions.

The work of covenantal pluralism is ultimately the work of love—love that transcends the boundaries of particular communities while honoring their distinctive contributions to human flourishing (Buber, 1970; Levinas, 1969). In pursuing this work, we participate in ancient dreams of unity-in-diversity that appear across religious traditions while creating new possibilities for human community worthy of our highest spiritual aspirations and capable of addressing our most pressing practical challenges.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

Chapter 5
Interfaith Futures

Introduction: The Evolution of Religious Encounter

Cross-cultural religious literacy represents a distinctive form of multicultural education with roots in the development of American Protestantism and its emphasis on individual scriptural interpretation and denominational diversity (Finke & Stark, 1992; Wuthnow, 1988). This educational approach gained significant momentum following the Second Vatican Council's reforms, particularly the 1965 Nostra Aetate declaration that explicitly promoted understanding, dialogue, and reconciliation with other religious traditions (Fitzgerald & Borelli, 2006; Valkenberg, 2016). What began as a generally Western endeavor has evolved into a global innovation characterized by systematic and rational attempts to engage with the theology and practice of religious others—not for missionary purposes but to promote both community cohesion and peace across religious differences (Eck, 2001; Patel, 2012).

This contemporary approach to interfaith engagement represents a fundamental departure from historical patterns of religious encounter, which typically involved power imbalances, cultural domination, or purely utilitarian interactions (Said, 1978; Asad, 1993). Understanding these historical precedents proves essential for appreciating both the novelty and the potential of current interfaith initiatives, as well as the persistent challenges they face in diverse global contexts (Forward, 2001; Race, 2001).

The transformation from traditional forms of religious encounter to contemporary interfaith dialogue reflects broader changes in global consciousness, educational philosophy, and political organization that have emerged over the past several centuries (Habermas, 1991; Taylor, 1989). However, this transformation remains incomplete and contested, with significant variations across different cultural, political, and economic contexts that shape possibilities for meaningful religious engagement (Bruce, 2003; Norris & Inglehart, 2004).

© The Author(s) 2026

I. Akhtar, *Covenantal Pluralism*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-31479-6_5

Historical Patterns of Interreligious Engagement

Traditional Forms of Religious Encounter

Historically, interreligious engagement manifested in five primary forms, each characterized by distinctive power dynamics, motivations, and outcomes that continue to influence contemporary interfaith relations (Sharpe, 1977; Smith, 1963). Understanding these patterns provides crucial context for evaluating current interfaith initiatives and anticipating future challenges and opportunities.

The first historical form involved appropriation—the selective adoption and adaptation of religious elements from one tradition into another, often accompanied by significant transformation of meaning and practice (Pye, 1971; Stewart & Shaw, 1994). The Romanization of Greek religious traditions exemplifies this pattern, as does the influence of pre-Christian goddess traditions on Catholic Marian devotion (Brown, 1981; Warner, 1976). These processes typically reflected power differentials between conquering and conquered peoples, with dominant groups selectively incorporating elements from subordinated traditions while maintaining overall control of religious meaning and institutional authority.

Appropriation often involved complex negotiations between cultural preservation and adaptation, as communities sought to maintain essential elements of their traditions while accommodating new political and social realities (Berger, 1967; Geertz, 1973). The results frequently proved creative and generative, producing new forms of religious expression that transcended original cultural boundaries while creating potential for both enrichment and exploitation (Appadurai, 1996; Hannerz, 1992).

The second form, which continues to flourish in southern and eastern Asian contexts, involved communal worship at shared sacred sites where different religious communities sought spiritual benefits from saints, spirits, or divine presences without necessarily engaging in theological dialogue (Gombrich & Obeyesekere, 1988; Tambiah, 1970). These practices typically served practical and ritualistic aims, with individuals seeking mediation, healing, protection, or prosperity through access to spiritual power located at particular geographical sites.

Such arrangements often reflected pragmatic accommodation rather than theological synthesis, allowing different communities to maintain their distinctive beliefs and practices while acknowledging the spiritual efficacy of shared sacred locations (McDaniel, 2004; Raj & Dempsey, 2010). This model demonstrates possibilities for peaceful coexistence without requiring doctrinal agreement or institutional merger, though it may also perpetuate separation rather than promoting deeper understanding or cooperation.

The third form emerged through commercial networks that facilitated both trade and cultural exchange across vast geographical regions (Abu-Lughod, 1989; Frank, 1998). The Silk Road represents the most famous example, through which Buddhism spread from India to Japan and throughout the South Pacific region, reaching as far as Indonesia through merchant activities rather than organized missionary efforts (Sen, 2003; Ray, 1996).

Much of the conversion to Islam in Southeast Asia similarly occurred through cultural accommodation and commercial advantage rather than explicit religious seeking (Ricklefs, 1993; Reid, 1993). Merchant communities often served as cultural intermediaries, facilitating not only economic exchange but also the transmission of ideas, practices, and technologies that transformed receiving societies in ways that extended far beyond purely religious change (Curtin, 1984; Ptak, 1998).

The fourth form involved conquest and colonization, which typically disrupted existing religious institutions and imposed economic and social costs on adherence to older traditions while promoting new religious allegiances (Comaroff & Comaroff, 1991; Ranger, 1986). Medieval Islamic and Christian conquests, as well as colonial proselytization throughout the Americas, Africa, and Asia during recent centuries, exemplify this coercive model of religious transformation (Bulliet, 1994; Neill, 1964).

Colonial religious encounter often combined spiritual, political, and economic domination in ways that made voluntary conversion difficult to distinguish from strategic accommodation to new power structures (Viswanathan, 1989; van der Veer, 2001). The legacy of these encounters continues to influence contemporary interfaith relations, particularly in postcolonial contexts where religious difference intersects with historical grievances and ongoing inequalities (Sugirtharajah, 2001; Pieris, 1988).

The fifth and most recent form represents what has been pioneered as interfaith education and dialogue: systematic and rational attempts to engage with religious others that transcend personal relationships to include theological and cultural dimensions (Knitter, 1985; Swidler, 1987). This approach explicitly rejects missionary aims while promoting mutual understanding, community development, and conflict prevention through structured encounter across religious boundaries.

Most multicultural, multilingual, and multiethnic societies throughout history have managed religious diversity through parallel coexistence rather than active engagement (Furnivall, 1948; Smith, 1965). Theological discussions among people of different faiths were often prohibited or strictly regulated, reflecting concerns about doctrinal contamination, social disruption, or political instability (Nederman, 2000; Muldoon, 1979).

Western Intellectual Foundations and Global Adaptations

Positive engagement with others' theology—in contrast to premodern negative engagement through polemics and apologetics—emerged as part of broader intellectual developments within Western civilization (McGrath, 2001; Plantinga, 2000). Western Christianity, particularly through Thomas Aquinas's synthesis of Aristotelian philosophy with Christian doctrine, increasingly embraced rationality over mysticism, creating intellectual frameworks that could accommodate systematic engagement with alternative theological systems (Gilson, 1952; Marenbon, 1997).

This rationalist orientation, which remained less prominent in Orthodox churches of the East, gained further momentum during the Enlightenment and achieved particular importance during the scientific revolution (Gay, 1966; Israel, 2001). The Western tendency to understand religion primarily as beliefs (orthodoxy) rather than correct action (orthopraxis) created both opportunities and limitations for interfaith engagement (Lindbeck, 1984; McCutcheon, 1997).

While rational discourse enables systematic comparison and evaluation of different theological claims, it may also diminish appreciation for experiential, ritualistic, and community-based dimensions of religious life that prove central to many traditions (Flood, 1999; Smart, 1996). This tension between intellectual analysis and lived religion continues to challenge interfaith education programs that must balance academic rigor with respect for diverse approaches to spiritual truth and practice.

Contemporary religious literacy programs face several persistent objections that reflect both historical experiences and contemporary concerns about cultural imperialism and social cohesion (Dinham & Francis, 2015; Jackson, 2004). The first major objection involves accusations that teachers are attempting to proselytize or indoctrinate students into particular traditions, reflecting colonial-era fears that have not diminished in the postcolonial period but persist as part of Global North/South divisions regarding power, wealth, and cultural influence (Bhabha, 1994; Spivak, 1988).

These concerns prove particularly acute in contexts where religious education has historically served assimilationist purposes or where contemporary interfaith initiatives appear connected to broader Western cultural influence (Mazrui, 1986; Nandy, 1983). Building trust requires transparent communication about goals, methods, and outcomes, as well as genuine partnership with local religious communities and educational institutions (Freire, 1970; hooks, 1994).

The second major objection dismisses such programs as irrelevant to societies that consider themselves already peaceful and prosperous, where all citizens are equally valued regardless of religious affiliation (Bruce, 2002; Putnam & Campbell, 2010). This perspective reflects overly optimistic assessments of social harmony that fail to recognize subtle forms of discrimination, the fragility of peaceful arrangements, or the potential for rapid deterioration during crisis periods (Horowitz, 2001; Varshney, 2002).

Such complacency often assumes that existing national ideologies or dominant religious traditions already account for differences in sufficiently inclusive ways, overlooking the experiences of marginalized communities and the dynamic nature of religious diversity in globalizing societies (Modood, 2007; Parekh, 2000).

The Case for Interfaith Learning

The first argument for interfaith learning emphasizes its role in dispelling stereotypes and reducing suspicion of both near and distant others, which can create social cleavages that become exacerbated during periods of political unrest and economic downturn (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Interfaith dialogue embodies preventive peacebuilding and community development approaches that seek to mitigate conflict before it occurs, rather than focusing primarily on post-conflict reconciliation and reconstruction (Appleby, 2000; Lederach, 1997).

From the perspective of the longue durée of human history, the nation-state represents a relatively recent and potentially transitional form of political organization that has undergone and will continue to experience transformation into new arrangements (Anderson, 1991; Gellner, 1983). Contemporary global processes involve simultaneous fragmentation—as seen in the Balkans and Sudan—of imposed colonial states into more organic ethnic and religious political orders, alongside centralization processes that create larger unified identities like the modern Chinese imperium or the European Union (Appadurai, 1996; Held et al., 1999).

In these evolving political contexts, religious literacy proves vital for maintaining social harmony and economic stability that enable complex political projects to flourish across diverse populations (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005; Putnam, 2007). However, the challenge facing religious literacy efforts involves creating genuine critical academic discourse while avoiding co-optation by state authorities as tools of political propaganda or social control (Apple, 2000; Giroux, 1988).

Securing the independence of interfaith learning spaces as intellectual centers for honest dialogue and debate proves critical to their long-term impact and their ability to guarantee and maintain religious freedom and rights in diverse societies (Menand, 1996). This requires careful attention to institutional design, funding sources, governance structures, and accountability mechanisms that can protect educational integrity while remaining responsive to community needs and concerns.

The second argument for interfaith learning highlights the remarkable intellectual and spiritual insights within faith traditions that, in conversation with secular knowledge systems, can help address contemporary global challenges (Gottlieb, 2006; Tucker & Grim, 2001). The reorientation of Abrahamic traditions during recent decades toward planetary ethics of care, moving away from biblical conceptions of human dominion over earth, exemplifies how interfaith engagement can generate innovative responses to urgent problems (Berry, 1988; White, 1967).

This transformation has emerged through engagement with indigenous religious traditions and secular environmental movements, leading to the recovery of classical and medieval religious resources of stewardship from the world's great traditions and their application as faith-based responses to global climate change (Foltz et al., 2003; Gottlieb, 2004). Similar collaborative processes could address other contemporary challenges including economic inequality, technological disruption, migration pressures, and cultural conflicts that require both practical solutions and meaning-making frameworks.

Religious traditions possess unique resources for motivating individual behavior change, providing ethical frameworks for evaluating complex choices, mobilizing community action, and sustaining long-term commitment to difficult transformations (Putnam & Campbell, 2010; Norris & Inglehart, 2004). However, accessing these resources effectively requires interfaith cooperation that transcends traditional institutional boundaries while respecting particular theological commitments and spiritual practices.

Case Study: Indonesia as a Model of Religious Pluralism

Indonesia provides one of the most compelling contemporary examples of successful religious pluralism in a Muslim-majority society, offering valuable insights for understanding the conditions that enable diverse religious communities to coexist peacefully while maintaining their distinctive identities and practices (Hefner, 2000; Ramage, 1995). The cross-cultural religious literacy programs of organizations like the Templeton Religion Trust and the Leimina Institute, combined with Indonesia's national experience, reveal several characteristics essential for effective pluralistic arrangements.

Indonesia has created a favorable environment for diversity through multiple interconnected factors that reflect both historical circumstances and deliberate policy choices (Bowen, 2003; Liddle, 1996). Understanding these factors provides insights applicable to other contexts while recognizing the particular features of Indonesian society that may not be easily replicated elsewhere.

First, Indonesia's national ideology, Pancasila, explicitly embraces diversity and difference as national assets rather than liabilities or problems to be managed (Morfit, 1981; Ramage, 1995). The "five principles" or "five moralities"—belief in God, civilized humanity, unity of Indonesia, democracy, and social justice—embed basic pluralistic concepts that can be interpreted to facilitate greater openness and equality across religious and ethnic boundaries (Hefner, 2000; Ricklefs, 2008).

Both the geographically dispersed nature of the country as a collection of over 13,000 islands and the choice of Bahasa Indonesia (based on Malay) as the national language support this openness to diversity (Andréfouët et al., 2022; Sneddon, 2003). Malay itself developed as a lingua franca through centuries of intercultural exchange, making it particularly well-suited to connect and bring into conversation the various vernacular experiences and varied histories of the nation and region (Adelaar & Himmelmann, 2005; Collins, 1998).

This linguistic choice created opportunities for inclusive national identity formation that transcended particular ethnic or religious communities while providing mechanisms for maintaining local distinctiveness within broader national frameworks (Anderson, 1991; Hooker, 2003). The success of this approach demonstrates how language policy can either support or undermine pluralistic arrangements, depending on whether it facilitates communication across differences or reinforces existing hierarchies and exclusions.

Second, effective pluralism requires consistent government communication across agencies and representatives supporting pluralism as a state institution-building project (Norris, 2005; Stepan, 2000). Pluralism needs official sanction as a legitimate value to protect citizens working toward pluralistic goals in their communities, particularly given the modern state's extensive coercive power in both physical and digital realms (Mann, 1993; Tilly, 1990).

Consistent government support for policies of non-interference in communal matters and celebration of diversity as a social good—even if only rhetorical—creates space for the flourishing of religious minorities and dissenters within majority communities (Kymlicka, 1995; Young, 2000). However, such support proves fragile and can be withdrawn during crisis periods or political transitions, making constitutional protections and institutional safeguards essential for long-term sustainability (Horowitz, 1985; Lijphart, 1977).

Third, developing institutional infrastructure within rule-of-law frameworks proves critical for generating intergenerational knowledge, awareness, and action toward building sustainable pluralism (Diamond, 1999; O'Donnell, 1999). Unfortunately, such multigenerational efforts can be destroyed within a single generation, as demonstrated by the breakup of Yugoslavia and subsequent ethnonationalist violence that contrasted sharply with Albania's historical tradition of religious pluralism (Malcolm, 1994; Vickers, 1995).

Albania's protection of Jews during the Holocaust and its distinction as the first Muslim-majority country to establish a memorial honoring Holocaust victims illustrate how pluralistic values can persist even under adverse conditions when supported by strong cultural traditions and institutional foundations (Gershtenfeld et al., 2003; Sarner, 1997). However, the contrast with events in other Balkan regions demonstrates how brutality and oppression can translate difference into otherness, encouraging depredation and dehumanization that frames diversity as zero-sum competition rather than mutual enrichment (Ignatieff, 1993; Kaplan, 1993).

Fourth, government support alone cannot guarantee religious pluralism without robust civil society organizations capable of independent action and local response to promote pluralistic values (Diamond, 1994; Putnam, 2000). As powerful as modern states have become, societal norms often prove stronger predictors of individual and group behavior than official policies or legal frameworks (Coleman, 1990; Fukuyama, 1995).

In many parts of the Global South, when people discuss social problems or societal conditions, responses typically begin with variations of "The government should…" or "The government doesn't…" This pattern reflects both reasonable expectations of state responsibility and problematic tendencies to justify individual inaction toward communal goods (Migdal, 1988; Scott, 1998).

A functioning and robust civil society outside government structures proves essential for organizing locally and responding nationally to promote pluralistic values through voluntary associations ranging from student groups to faith communities (Cohen & Arato, 1992; Keane, 1998). The aggregate of such fellowships constitutes civil society, which requires organization, self-reflection, and strategic direction to thrive in ways that complement rather than compete with state authority.

The interlocking commitments of government and civil society can be visualized as planetary atmospheric systems with multiple layers of varying density moving in diverse harmony to constitute sustainable environments for human flourishing (Putnam, 1993; Ostrom, 1990). This metaphor suggests the complexity and interdependence required for successful pluralistic arrangements that cannot be achieved through either state action or civil society initiatives alone.

Fifth, the most critical factor for long-term success of pluralism involves sustained economic development that provides opportunities for advancement and hope for better futures (Sen, 1999; Stiglitz, 2002). Economic prosperity represents the most reliable foundation for communal harmony, while economic downturns can be easily exploited by politicians seeking to scapegoat religious and ethnic minorities for broader social problems (Brass, 1997; Horowitz, 1985).

This relationship proves particularly important in countries with growing populations where younger generations must have realistic hopes for economic advancement and social mobility (Goldstone, 2002; Huntington, 1968). The extreme politics dominating many parts of the post-pandemic world can be traced to lack of hope or viable paths toward better futures, as exemplified by China's tang ping ("lying flat") movement representing youth disengagement from competitive economic systems (Jingyi, 2022; Zhang, 2021).

Indonesia's position as the largest economy in Southeast Asia, with steady growth and relatively low unemployment, enables diverse populations to find work, earn decent livings, and engage in social interaction across identity lines in cosmopolitan urban centers where pluralistic cultures naturally flourish (Booth, 1998; Hill, 2000). Cosmopolitanism typically emerges from port cities and commercial centers before spreading inland, suggesting the importance of economic networks for promoting cultural exchange and understanding (Appiah, 2006; Hannerz, 1996).

Sixth, leadership quality and vision prove decisive for pluralistic success even when other favorable conditions exist (Burns, 1978; Heifetz, 1994). Societies may possess constituent elements for pluralistic flourishing, but leaders must demonstrate foresight and commitment to invest in institutions, economic development, and national character formation that can withstand future challenges and crises (Evans, 1995; Putnam, 1993).

The contrast between South Korea and Pakistan during the second half of the twentieth century illustrates this dynamic dramatically (Amsden, 1989; Easterly, 2006). In the 1950s, Pakistan's economy was growing faster than South Korea's, but Park Chung-hee's assumption of power in South Korea through a 1961 coup led to economic and social reforms that transformed the country from one of the world's poorest to a significant global economic power by the late twentieth century (Haggard, 1990; Woo-Cumings, 1999).

Thrift and hard work became national mottos in South Korea, with even personal savings accessed to create the "economic miracle" of contemporary Korean development (Kim & Leipziger, 1993; Rodrik, 1995). In contrast, Pakistan's kleptocratic leadership—essentially a coalition of military and feudal powers—was severely disrupted during the Afghan crisis beginning with Soviet invasion, and institutional dysfunction continues today (Cohen, 2004; Jalal, 1995).

Pakistan's overinvestment in military spending and underinvestment in education, social services, and economic development created chronic dependency on loan bailouts from international institutions (IMF, World Bank) and sovereign lenders (China, Saudi Arabia) (Burki, 1999; Kukreja, 2003). Its geostrategic location has enabled survival through great power competition but only as a client state rather than as an equal partner in regional development.

Seventh, national histories and the particular languages through which they are told prove highly instructive for understanding possibilities and limitations for pluralistic development (Anderson, 1991; Hobsbawm, 1990). Historical trajectories create path dependencies that shape available options, though inflection points and "Overton windows" occasionally provide opportunities for significant change (Pierson, 2004; North, 1990).

The relationship between individual leadership and historical moments remains complex and contested (Carlyle, 1841; Hook, 1943). Pakistan's case suggests that historical opportunities can be squandered by inept leadership, while Barack Obama's US presidency might represent a moment that did not present itself for dramatic change, whereas Trump presidencies coincided with crisis periods (COVID-19, economic disruption) that enabled more significant transformations (Greenstein, 2009; Skowronek, 1997).

History provides guidance for how societies understand themselves as civilizations and approach contemporary challenges based on accumulated experiences and interpretive frameworks (Eisenstadt, 2000; Huntington, 1996). The Western model emphasizing individual rights, though imperfect, enables economic, political, and social diversity essential for pluralistic arrangements (Dworkin, 1977; Glendon, 1991).

Chinese imperial history, viewed from governmental centers, represents a grand narrative of state legitimacy (mandate of heaven) that becomes destabilized through internal challenges like peasant revolts or external attacks by "barbarian" peoples such as the Xiongnu of the eastern steppes (Dreyer, 2007; Fairbank, 1992). Contemporary Chinese responses to diversity emphasize enforcing conformity as the path to long-term stability, with ideological and ethnic uniformity considered critical for building and maintaining imagined Han majority identity through unified language and information control (Bovingdon, 2010; Gladney, 1991).

The Chinese approach to Tibet exemplifies this political perspective across different administrations, treating diversity as a threat to stability rather than a resource for development (Goldstein, 1997; Norberg-Hodge, 1991). From this perspective, human rights are defined not as individual entitlements prerequisite to political organization but as collective community benefits measured by practical results rather than valued as intrinsic political goods (Bell, 2000; Peerenboom, 2002).

Regional Context and Civilizational Influences

Indonesia's success in defining itself as a center of pluralistic Islam within the global Muslim community enables the country to establish modern identity and moral authority independent of historic Eurasian Islamic centers, particularly following September 11 and the subsequent War on Terror (Fealy & Hooker, 2006; Hefner, 2000). Indonesian diplomats have become prominent representatives of "moderate Islam" to global audiences, contributing to both national prestige and practical diplomatic advantages (Acharya, 2014; Sukma, 2003).

The country's economic success builds partly on political stability that state policies and pragmatism have made possible, shaping national consciousness since independence in ways that allow various ethnic groups to find space within expansive understandings of Islam that accommodate myriad cultural manifestations (Ramage, 1995; Ricklefs, 200). The absolutist Wahhabi/Salafi ideology emerging from Saudi Arabia during the late twentieth century was correctly perceived as threatening the delicate coalition of peoples and power structures constituting modern Indonesia (Bruinessen, 2013; Hasan, 2006).

The flexible nature of Pancasila ideology allows for ongoing interpretation and reinterpretation according to changing social norms and state policies, providing mechanisms for adaptation without abandoning foundational commitments (Hefner, 2000; Morfit, 1981). This flexibility proves essential for managing diversity in rapidly changing social and economic conditions.

Indonesia, like other archipelago nations including Malaysia and Singapore, maintains non-aligned positions that avoid choosing sides in current US-China competition for global hegemony (Acharya, 2014; Leifer, 2000). The loss of East Timor and the end of Suharto's dictatorship weakened military influence within Indonesian politics, contributing to democratic consolidation and institutional development that contrasts with authoritarian trends in neighboring Thailand (Aspinall, 2005; Liddle & Mujani, 2007).

Southeast Asia's position at the conjunction of Indic and Sinic civilizations—reflected in the French colonial designation "Indochina"—creates unique opportunities for cultural synthesis and adaptation (SarDesai, 1994; Tarling, 1992). Borobudur, one of the largest classical Hindu temple complexes, located in Java near Yogyakarta, symbolizes this historical confluence, while classical Malay's heavy borrowing from Sanskrit demonstrates ongoing cultural exchange (Kulke, 1993; Miksic, 1990).

The Straits of Malacca formed crucial maritime bridges between India and China for agricultural trade, particularly spices that gave the region its historical designation as the "Spice Islands" (Ptak, 1998; Sen, 2009). Commerce, maritime activity, and cultural arts flourishing helped develop unique cultural forms that interacted with Islam additively rather than exclusively, contrasting with land-based imperial conquests that sometimes suppressed pre-Islamic influences on Muslim development (Reid, 1993; Ricklefs, 1993).

Indonesia's less rigid approach to Islamic practice has enabled greater flourishing of cultural and religious diversity, demonstrated through well-preserved temples and

Buddhist stupas that reflect cultural confidence rather than anxiety about non-Islamic heritage (Geertz, 1960; Woodward, 1989). This confidence enables Indonesians to interact with other Muslims through traditions of practicality while building bridges to more stringent cultural and religious identities, such as Arab cultural forms that appear to allow less space for diversity and pre-Islamic heritage expression (Bowen, 1993; Hefner, 2000).

Adherents to extreme Islamic interpretations often seem unable to understand, appreciate, or integrate past and present into generative identities, as demonstrated by Taliban destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas in Afghanistan and ISIS destruction of Palmyra in Syria (Bahrani, 2016; Flood, 2002). These destructive acts reflect anxiety about cultural authenticity and religious purity that contrasts sharply with Indonesian approaches to managing religious and cultural diversity.

The colonial struggle with the Dutch for independence and loss of prosperous territories like Brunei and Singapore undoubtedly impacted Indonesian development significantly (Ricklefs, 200; Reid, 1974). Regional competition among Malay-speaking peoples and desires for self-determination meant that developmental discourses were shared across the Malay-speaking world, exemplified by Malaysia's Mahathir Mohamed articulating Islamic visions of development emphasizing self-sufficiency and taking bold steps during the 1997 financial crisis to avoid middle-income development traps (Jomo, 2001; Mahathir, 1970).

Lessons from Pluralistic Muslim Communities

Examining commonalities among pluralistic Muslim communities—including Albania, Oman, and Indonesia—reveals several prerequisites for pluralistic Islamic interpretations that may be applicable to other contexts (Esposito & Voll, 1996; Piscatori, 1986). These characteristics suggest patterns that transcend particular national circumstances while remaining sensitive to local conditions and historical experiences.

First, successful pluralistic Muslim communities typically have experienced peripherality or minoritization that exposed them to diversity requiring navigation strategies unfamiliar to Muslims in central Islamic regions (Bulliet, 1994; Robinson, 2000). Ibadi Muslims in Oman, Albanian Muslims in the majority non-Muslim Ottoman Empire, and Indonesian Muslims on the periphery of Persian-Turkic-Arabic centers of Islamic civilization all developed approaches to religious diversity shaped by liminal positions requiring accommodation and adaptation (Malcolm, 1998; Reid, 1993; Wilkinson, 1987).

This degree of liminality exposes societies to diversity and difference requiring navigation approaches that Arabs living at centers of Muslim civilization might not experience or understand in their Islamic interpretations (Hodgson, 1974; Lapidus, 1988). Peripheral positions often generate pragmatic approaches to religious practice and interpretation that prioritize practical coexistence over theological purity or cultural authenticity.

Second, pluralistic success requires political stability and resource generosity enabling most citizens to enjoy middle-class lives without extreme scarcity that leads to tribalism (Diamond, 1992; Lipset, 1959). Extreme resource scarcity, as experienced in Sudan, encourages zero-sum thinking about survival that does not support generosity toward others but instead promotes blaming others for violence and economic hardship (Keen, 1994; Deng, 1995).

Albania, Oman, and Indonesia represent politically stable middle-income countries with sufficient resources to enable most populations to aspire to middle-class lifestyles and social mobility (Elbasani, 2013; Hill, 2000; Valeri, 2009). This economic foundation proves essential for creating social conditions where religious difference can be viewed as enriching rather than threatening community welfare and individual opportunities.

Third, pluralism requires freedom for voluntary association and civil society development that can create ideas and programs supporting religious diversity independent of direct state control (Diamond, 1994; Putnam, 2000). State resources remain finite and governmental attention varies, particularly in electoral democracies where political priorities shift with changing leadership and circumstances (Dahl, 1989; Przeworski, 1991).

De facto approval of pluralism as state ideology allows civil society actors to develop projects and programming independent of government direction, which states can then use instrumentally on global stages to demonstrate conformity with liberal international norms and thereby receive financial or political support (Edwards, 2004; Keane, 1998). Freedom to practice religion and find fellowship in voluntary communities must be enshrined in laws and norms regularly restated as policy to provide security for pluralistic initiatives.

Fourth, accountability mechanisms and lower levels of perceived corruption prove essential for pluralistic program success (Rose-Ackerman, 1999; Rothstein, 2011). Pluralism rests fundamentally on trust that others will attempt to act ethically when opportunities arise, and corruption erodes this trust much more easily than it can be created or restored (Rothstein & Uslaner, 2005; Uslaner, 2002).

Some feedback mechanisms from populations to governments—even in non-democratic systems—are essential for creating transparency levels that ensure both social harmony and economic progress (Diamond, 1999; O'Donnell, 1999). The Suharto regime, overthrown during the 199 Asian financial crisis, exemplified crony capitalism privileging elites over majority populations while failing to adapt to shifting labor dynamics, power relationships, and capital flows necessary for sustainable urban development (MacIntyre, 2001; Robison & Rosser, 1998).

In traditional cultures, pluralistic programs can be undermined by resource maldistribution that damages faith in political institutions and democratic processes (Horowitz, 1985; Varshney, 2002). Sustainable progress toward pluralism can be measured through improvements in international rankings like Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index, providing objective indicators of institutional development.

Fifth, in addition to minoritization experiences, communities that have encountered difference through trading relationships over extended periods prove more

receptive to pluralistic arrangements (Abu-Lughod, 1998, Curtin, 1984). Encountering difference over centuries on one's own terms and territory in ways that enhance life—such as through profitable trade relationships—makes difference experiences less threatening and more potentially beneficial (Frank, 1998; Sen, 2003).

All major Muslim nations embracing pluralism today possess histories as central trading ports with extensive contacts with other civilizations reflected in their languages and cultural practices (Chaudhuri, 1985; Das Gupta, 1994). Bahasa Indonesia exemplifies this pattern with grammatically simple structure and more than 40% loanwords from diverse languages ranging from classical Sanskrit to modern Dutch, reflecting centuries of cultural exchange and adaptation (Collins, 1998; Sneddon, 2003).

Southeast Asian labor remains highly valued throughout the world from Dubai to Dallas, particularly for interpersonal work such as caregiving, reflecting cultural skills developed through historical experience managing diversity and cross-cultural communication (Piper, 2005; Yeoh & Huang, 1998).

To succeed in trading environments, communities must serve as intermediaries between foreign traders and local populations, with wealth gained from these roles providing authority and influence within state structures (North, 1991; Greif, 2006). Success as intermediaries requires abilities to read people accurately, demonstrate sensitivity to cultural differences, understand market dynamics, and predict future trends—skills that prove valuable for managing religious and ethnic diversity in contemporary contexts.

Successful traders cannot afford ideological worldviews that distort reality; they must accurately assess, confront, and predict actual conditions affecting their activities (Weber, 1905/2002; Sombart, 1913). However, the variable nature of trade and constant exposure to difference may also make trading communities more conservative and fatalistic in their approach to social change, creating complex relationships between commercial success and political innovation.

Significantly, there appear to be no documented cases of Muslim violent extremists emerging from established Muslim mercantile communities, suggesting important connections between economic freedom and religious pluralism (Roy, 2004; Sageman, 2004). Successful market systems, particularly in free-trade zones, embrace difference, change, and novelty without feeling threatened by or threatening others, creating confidence that enables categorizing and understanding diversity as opportunity rather than danger (Hirschman, 1977; Sen, 1999).

Contemporary Challenges and Future Prospects

The primary conceptual challenge facing pluralism in contemporary multicultural societies involves developing imagination and creativity necessary for dealing positively with rapid social change (Castells, 1996; Bauman, 2000). National imaginaries, particularly in postcolonial contexts, often remain trapped in nineteenth-century notions of nationhood and statehood that assume contiguity between national

ideological views of majorities and shifting realities of difference among multiple minorities (Anderson, 1991; Chatterjee, 1993).

In daily practice, people often demonstrate pluralism more effectively than they can articulate it theoretically, but individual resentments can be instrumentalized by politicians seeking to disrupt practical accommodation processes for electoral or ideological advantage (Norris, 2005; Putnam, 2007). The cognitive disconnect between abstract fears of "the immigrant as other" and personal relationships with "my Chinese doctor" illustrates how political rhetoric can exploit anxieties while contradicting lived experiences of successful diversity (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

This disconnect between imagined others blamed for global imbalances of wealth—low wages, high prices, limited opportunities—and actual interpersonal relationships makes populations especially susceptible to authoritarian rhetoric that promises simple solutions to complex problems (Mudde, 2007; Norris & Inglehart, 2019). Authoritarianism proves fundamentally incompatible with pluralism because authoritarian systems require single stories and centralized power structures that cannot tolerate deviation or alternative narratives (Applebaum, 2020; Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018).

Both critical thinking skills and abilities to imagine shared futures represent essential educational priorities for ensuring pluralism's survival in the age of artificial intelligence (Gardner, 2008; Zhao, 2012). The AI era for pluralism means that factual information becomes readily available through technological systems, but interpretation requires human ethical reasoning that can navigate competing claims and complex moral choices (Floridi, 2019; O'Neil, 2016).

Educational systems must develop curricula that prepare students to engage constructively with religious and cultural diversity while maintaining capacity for independent judgment and ethical reasoning (Banks, 2004; Nieto, 2010). This requires moving beyond simple tolerance or superficial multiculturalism toward sophisticated understanding of how different worldviews can contribute to addressing shared challenges while respecting legitimate differences in values and practices (Parekh, 2000; Kymlicka, 1995).

The development of global competencies that enable effective cross-cultural communication and collaboration represents a practical necessity for economic success as well as social harmony in interconnected societies (Suárez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004; Zhao, 2010). Students need opportunities to engage with diverse perspectives in structured environments that promote both understanding and critical evaluation of different approaches to fundamental human questions.

Digital technologies present both unprecedented opportunities and significant challenges for interfaith engagement and religious literacy education (Campbell, 2012; Hoover & Echchaibi, 2014). Virtual reality and augmented reality systems may soon enable immersive experiences of different religious traditions, allowing participants to "visit" sacred sites, observe ritual practices, and engage with religious teachings in ways previously impossible without extensive travel and community access (Bailenson, 2018; Schroeder, 2008).

However, digital environments also enable the rapid spread of misinformation, conspiracy theories, and extremist ideologies that can undermine pluralistic values and promote intergroup hostility (Benkler et al., 2018; Tucker et al., 2018). Social media platforms can create echo chambers that reinforce existing prejudices while providing tools for harassment and intimidation of religious minorities and interfaith advocates (Sunstein, 2001; Pariser, 2011).

Artificial intelligence systems raise fundamental questions about religious authority, spiritual guidance, and authentic religious experience that different traditions will need to address as these technologies become more sophisticated and widely available (Campbell, 2016; Cheong et al., 2012). Can AI systems provide genuine spiritual insight, or does authentic religious wisdom require human relationship and community engagement that cannot be replicated through technological means?

The democratization of religious authority through digital platforms enables both progressive interfaith initiatives and reactionary movements that exploit religious symbols for political purposes (Anderson, 2015; Bunt, 2009). Managing these dynamics requires sophisticated media literacy education combined with strong institutional frameworks that can distinguish between authentic religious engagement and political manipulation of religious identity.

Climate change represents perhaps the most urgent challenge requiring unprecedented interfaith cooperation at global scales (McKibben, 2007; Klein, 2014). Religious communities possess unique resources for motivating individual behavior change, providing ethical frameworks for environmental decision-making, and sustaining long-term commitment to difficult transitions away from carbon-intensive lifestyles (Gottlieb, 2006; Tucker & Grim, 2001).

However, environmental cooperation also reveals tensions between different religious approaches to nature, technology, development, and human responsibility that must be navigated carefully to maintain interfaith partnerships (Nasr, 1996; White, 1967). Some traditions emphasize human stewardship and technological solutions, while others prioritize harmony with natural systems and limitations on material consumption that may conflict with development aspirations in poorer societies.

Climate-induced migration and resource scarcity are already generating conflicts that require interfaith collaboration for refugee assistance, conflict resolution, and sustainable development initiatives (McMichael et al., 2012; Reuveny, 2007). These challenges transcend national boundaries and require coordination across political and religious divisions while maintaining sensitivity to local community concerns and cultural values.

The urgency of environmental crisis may provide opportunities for breakthrough interfaith cooperation that moves beyond dialogue toward coordinated action on shared survival concerns (Berry, 1988; McFague, 1993). Success will require balancing immediate practical needs with longer-term relationship building and institutional development that can sustain cooperation beyond current crisis periods.

Growing economic inequality within and between societies creates challenges for pluralistic arrangements that depend on broadly shared prosperity and social

mobility opportunities (Piketty, 2014; Stiglitz, 2012). Religious traditions offer alternative frameworks for understanding wealth, poverty, and economic justice that could inform more equitable approaches to global development (Finn, 2013; Stackhouse et al., 1995).

Islamic banking principles, Jewish concepts of jubilee and debt forgiveness, Christian liberation theology, and Buddhist economics provide resources for imagining alternatives to purely profit-driven economic systems that often exacerbate inequality and environmental degradation (El-Gamal, 2006; Gutiérrez, 1973; Schumacher, 1973). However, translating these religious insights into practical policies requires interfaith cooperation and engagement with secular economic institutions.

The challenge involves developing contemporary applications of traditional teachings that address modern realities—globalized markets, digital currencies, automated production—while maintaining spiritual authenticity and practical effectiveness (Atherton, 2008; Novak, 1982). This requires ongoing dialogue between religious communities and economic institutions to explore how spiritual values can inform more sustainable and equitable approaches to wealth creation and distribution.

Migration pressures driven by economic inequality, political instability, and environmental degradation create additional challenges for pluralistic societies that must balance humanitarian obligations with concerns about social cohesion and cultural change (Betts, 2013; Castles et al., 2013). Religious traditions provide resources for addressing these challenges through concepts of hospitality, sanctuary, and universal human dignity, but applying these principles requires careful attention to practical implementation and community preparation.

Institutional Models and Best Practices

Successful interfaith education programs share several characteristics that enable them to achieve transformative outcomes while avoiding common pitfalls that can generate backlash or superficial engagement (Eck, 2006; Patel, 2007). These programs typically combine intellectual content with experiential learning, provide structured opportunities for relationship building across religious boundaries, and create supportive environments for processing challenging questions and emotional responses.

Effective curricula balance information about different religious traditions with opportunities for participants to reflect on their own beliefs and assumptions while engaging with alternative perspectives (Jackson, 2004; Moore, 2007). This requires sophisticated pedagogical approaches that can hold complexity without collapsing into relativism or reinforcing existing stereotypes and prejudices.

Assessment strategies must evaluate both cognitive learning and attitude change while recognizing that transformation often occurs gradually and may not be immediately apparent through traditional testing methods (Banks, 2004; Sleeter & Grant, 2007). Portfolio approaches, reflective writing, and peer evaluation can provide more

comprehensive evidence of growth and development than standardized assessments focused primarily on factual knowledge.

Teacher preparation proves crucial for program success, requiring educators who possess both deep knowledge of religious traditions and sophisticated skills for facilitating difficult conversations across difference (Noddings, 2005; Palmer, 1998). This preparation must address personal biases and assumptions while developing capacity to create inclusive learning environments that honor diverse perspectives without avoiding controversial topics or genuine disagreements.

Sustainable interfaith education requires partnerships between academic institutions, religious communities, and civic organizations that can provide ongoing support, legitimacy, and resources for pluralistic initiatives (Austin, 2000; Bryson et al., 2006). These partnerships must balance academic freedom with community accountability while ensuring that programs serve authentic educational purposes rather than political or promotional agendas.

Religious communities bring theological expertise, community access, and spiritual authority to educational partnerships while potentially limiting participation to those already committed to particular traditions (Ammerman et al., 1998; McGuire, 2008). Academic institutions offer research capabilities, educational resources, and neutral venues while sometimes lacking deep community connections and practical implementation experience.

Community-based organizations provide grassroots connections and experience with social justice issues while often lacking resources for comprehensive programming (Putnam, 2000; Skocpol, 2003). Government agencies can offer funding and policy support while raising concerns about religious establishment and political manipulation of faith communities.

Successful partnerships require clear agreements about roles, responsibilities, and boundaries that respect each partner's distinctive contributions while maintaining shared commitment to pluralistic goals (Hardy et al., 2003; Huxham & Vangen, 2005). These arrangements must balance accountability with flexibility, allowing for adaptation and learning while maintaining program integrity and effectiveness.

Government policies significantly influence possibilities for successful interfaith education and community relations, though the specific mechanisms vary considerably across different political systems and cultural contexts (Stepan, 2000; Norris, 2005). Constitutional frameworks for religious freedom must balance individual liberty with community autonomy while preventing religious establishment or discrimination against minorities.

Legal protections for religious practice, expression, and education provide essential foundations for pluralistic arrangements, but implementation depends on administrative capacity, judicial independence, and cultural acceptance of diversity principles (Durham & Scharffs, 2010; Witte & Alexander, 2008). Even strong legal frameworks can prove ineffective without broader social support and institutional capacity for enforcement.

Educational policies regarding religious content in public schools, funding for faith-based institutions, and requirements for teacher certification in religious studies create important parameters for interfaith education programs (Haynes, 2011; Nord &

Haynes, 1998). These policies must navigate tensions between secular educational goals and recognition of religion's importance in human experience and cultural understanding.

International frameworks and standards for religious freedom and minority rights provide additional support for pluralistic initiatives while recognizing that implementation must be adapted to local conditions and cultural contexts (An-Na'im, 2008; Bielefeldt et al., 2016). Global networks of interfaith organizations and educational institutions can share resources and expertise while respecting national sovereignty and cultural autonomy.

Regional Variations and Comparative Analysis

European approaches to religious diversity and interfaith education reflect particular historical experiences with Christianity, Enlightenment secularism, and recent Muslim immigration that create both opportunities and constraints for pluralistic development (Bruce, 2003; Cesari, 2004). The European Union's commitment to human rights and religious freedom provides supportive frameworks for interfaith initiatives, while national variations in church-state relationships and integration policies create diverse contexts for implementation.

France's laïcité system emphasizes state neutrality and secular education while potentially limiting religious expression in public contexts, creating tensions between integration and accommodation approaches (Bowen, 2007; Scott, 2007). Germany's church tax system and religious education requirements provide institutional support for faith communities while raising questions about inclusion of newer religious minorities, particularly Muslim populations.

The United Kingdom's established church tradition combined with multicultural policies creates space for religious expression while generating debates about limits of accommodation and shared civic values (Modood, 2007; Parekh, 2000). Scandinavian countries balance strong secular welfare states with cultural Christianity in ways that provide interesting models for managing religious heritage while promoting inclusive citizenship.

European experiences with religious extremism, both Christian and Muslim, highlight challenges of distinguishing between authentic religious commitment and political manipulation of religious identity for violent purposes (Kepel, 2004; Roy, 2004). These experiences inform approaches to interfaith education that emphasize critical thinking and democratic values while respecting religious authority and community traditions.

Asian societies offer diverse models for managing religious plurality that reflect different historical experiences, political systems, and cultural traditions (Hefner, 2001; Madsen, 2007). Singapore's managed multiculturalism provides one approach to ethnic and religious diversity through government regulation and promotion of inter-community harmony, though critics argue this approach may suppress authentic difference in favor of superficial celebration.

India's constitutional secularism attempts to balance majority Hindu culture with protection for religious minorities, though implementation faces ongoing challenges from religious nationalism and intercommunal tensions (Bhargava, 1998; Madan, 1997). The Indian experience illustrates both possibilities and limitations of legal frameworks for protecting pluralism in societies with significant religious and cultural diversity.

China's approach to religious diversity emphasizes state control and cultural assimilation while officially recognizing five approved religions, creating tensions between religious freedom and political stability that affect ethnic minorities particularly severely (Madsen, 2003; Yang, 2006). The Chinese model raises important questions about whether genuine pluralism is possible without democratic institutions and civil society autonomy.

Japan's experience with religious diversity reflects historical isolation followed by rapid modernization and global integration, creating unique challenges for maintaining traditional culture while accommodating international influence and internal diversity (Mullins et al., 1993; Reader, 1991). Japanese approaches to new religious movements and foreign religious communities provide insights into processes of cultural adaptation and religious innovation.

African societies demonstrate remarkable religious creativity and adaptability that offer important insights for interfaith education and community relations (Gifford, 1998; Ranger, 2008). The prevalence of independent churches and syncretic religious movements illustrates how religious traditions can adapt to local conditions while maintaining connections to global religious networks.

South Africa's experience with religious diversity during and after apartheid provides valuable lessons about the role of faith communities in political transition and reconciliation processes (Chidester et al., 1994; Villa-Vicencio & De Gruchy, 1994). The Truth and Reconciliation Commission's incorporation of religious perspectives and rituals demonstrates how spiritual resources can contribute to healing historical wounds and building inclusive societies.

Nigeria's complex religious geography, with Christian-majority south and Muslim-majority north, creates ongoing challenges for national unity and peaceful coexistence that require sophisticated approaches to interfaith relations and conflict prevention (Falola, 1998; Kukah, 1993). Nigerian experiences with religious violence highlight both failures of pluralistic arrangements and possibilities for restoration through sustained interfaith engagement.

The growth of Pentecostal Christianity across Africa creates new dynamics for interfaith relations as these movements often emphasize exclusivist theology while demonstrating remarkable adaptability to local cultures and concerns (Anderson, 2004; Miller & Yamamori, 2007). Understanding how Pentecostal communities engage with religious diversity provides insights into contemporary challenges and opportunities for pluralistic development.

Latin American societies offer unique perspectives on religious diversity shaped by Catholic colonial heritage, indigenous spiritual traditions, and growing Protestant populations (Cleary & Stewart-Gambino, 1997; Stoll, 1990). Liberation theology

movements demonstrate how Christian communities can engage with social justice issues while building alliances across religious and secular boundaries.

Brazil's religious landscape includes not only Catholic and Protestant Christianity but also Afro-Brazilian traditions, spiritualism, and new religious movements that create complex patterns of religious belonging and practice (Brown, 1994; Chesnut, 1997). Brazilian experiences with religious syncretism and multiple belonging challenge traditional assumptions about exclusive religious identity while raising questions about authentic tradition and innovation.

Mexico's experience with Catholic cultural dominance and recent diversification provides insights into processes of religious change and the challenges of maintaining social cohesion during periods of rapid transformation (Camp, 1997; De la Torre & Gutiérrez, 2007). The role of indigenous communities in preserving alternative spiritual traditions while engaging with broader Mexican society illustrates possibilities for cultural preservation within pluralistic frameworks.

The growth of evangelical Protestantism throughout Latin America creates new challenges for Catholic-dominated societies while potentially providing resources for democratic development and civil society strengthening (Freston, 2008; Smith, 1998). Understanding how evangelical communities relate to other religious traditions and secular institutions provides insights into contemporary dynamics of religious competition and cooperation.

Future Scenarios and Strategic Planning

Under favorable conditions, interfaith education and community relations could evolve toward increasingly sophisticated forms of cooperation that address global challenges while honoring religious diversity and local autonomy (Appleby, 2000; Putnam, 2007). Technological advances might enable virtual collaboration across geographical boundaries while providing new tools for cultural exchange and mutual learning.

Educational systems could develop curricula that prepare students for global citizenship while maintaining appreciation for particular traditions and local communities (Banks, 2004; Suárez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004). Universities might establish international partnerships for interfaith research and education that share resources and expertise while respecting cultural differences and institutional autonomy.

Economic development guided by interfaith cooperation on environmental sustainability and social justice could create models for prosperity that transcend narrow nationalism and religious exclusivism (Gottlieb, 2006; Tucker & Grim, 2001). Cities and regions with successful pluralistic arrangements could become centers of innovation and cultural creativity that attract investment and talent from diverse global sources.

Political institutions might evolve toward more sophisticated forms of democracy that can accommodate cultural diversity while maintaining governmental effectiveness and popular legitimacy (Kymlicka, 2001; Lijphart, 1999). International organizations could develop frameworks for supporting pluralistic development while respecting national sovereignty and cultural autonomy.

Under adverse conditions, religious differences could become increasingly politicized and weaponized by authoritarian movements seeking to exploit social tensions for political advantage (Appleby, 2000; Juergensmeyer, 2003). Economic inequality and environmental degradation could exacerbate competition for resources while undermining social cohesion and trust across religious boundaries.

Technological systems might facilitate surveillance and control that enables repression of religious minorities while providing tools for extremist recruitment and radicalization (Morozov, 2011; Zuboff, 2019). Educational systems could be captured by political movements that promote religious or cultural chauvinism while undermining critical thinking and cross-cultural understanding.

International conflicts involving religious identity could spill over into domestic contexts, polarizing societies and undermining pluralistic arrangements that depend on peaceful coexistence and mutual respect (Huntington, 1996; Norris & Inglehart, 2004). Migration pressures and cultural change could generate backlash movements that exploit fears of difference while promoting exclusivist ideologies.

Democratic institutions might prove inadequate for managing complex cultural conflicts while authoritarian alternatives could offer apparent stability at the cost of freedom and diversity (Diamond, 2015; Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). The breakdown of international cooperation could leave pluralistic societies vulnerable to external pressure and internal fragmentation.

Preparing for multiple possible futures requires developing adaptive capacity and resilient institutions that can function effectively under varying conditions while maintaining commitment to pluralistic values (Folke et al., 2010; Walker et al., 2002). This involves building redundant systems, diverse partnerships, and flexible frameworks that can respond to unexpected challenges while preserving core functions and relationships.

Educational institutions need curricula and pedagogical approaches that prepare students for uncertainty while developing skills for cross-cultural communication, ethical reasoning, and collaborative problem-solving (Gardner, 2008; Zhao, 2012). These capabilities prove valuable regardless of specific future scenarios while providing foundations for constructive engagement with difference and change.

Religious communities require theological and practical resources for engaging with rapid social change while maintaining spiritual authenticity and community cohesion (Ammerman et al., 1998; McGuire, 2008). This includes developing sophisticated approaches to tradition and innovation that can honor religious heritage while adapting to new circumstances and opportunities.

Civic organizations need capacity for building bridges across difference while advocating for pluralistic values and policies that protect religious freedom and cultural diversity (Putnam, 2000; Skocpol, 2003). This requires both grassroots

organizing skills and policy advocacy capabilities that can influence governmental decisions and social norms.

Conclusion: Toward Sustainable Interfaith Futures

The future of interfaith relations and religious literacy education depends on our collective ability to learn from successful models like Indonesia while adapting insights to diverse local contexts and changing global conditions (Eck, 2001; Patel, 2012). This requires sustained commitment to both theoretical understanding and practical experimentation that can generate new approaches to ancient challenges of living peacefully across difference.

Success will be measured not by the elimination of religious difference or the creation of homogeneous societies, but by the development of sophisticated frameworks for managing diversity as a resource for human flourishing rather than a source of conflict and competition (Parekh, 2000; Taylor, 1994). This transformation requires fundamental changes in how we understand identity, community, and citizenship in an interconnected world.

The work of building interfaith futures involves patient relationship building, sustained dialogue that addresses both commonalities and genuine differences, collaborative action on shared concerns, and institutional innovation that can support diverse communities while maintaining social cohesion (Appleby, 2000; Putnam, 2007). This work cannot be accomplished through any single sector or approach but requires coordination across educational, religious, civic, and governmental institutions.

Ultimately, the future of interfaith relations reflects broader questions about human capacity for cooperation across difference in addressing challenges that transcend particular communities and national boundaries (Keohane & Nye, 2011; Held et al., 1999). Climate change, technological disruption, economic inequality, and cultural transformation require forms of collaboration that honor diversity while enabling collective action on shared concerns.

The Indonesian model and other successful examples of religious pluralism demonstrate that such cooperation is possible under favorable conditions, but they also reveal the fragility of pluralistic arrangements and the constant vigilance required to maintain them (Hefner, 2000; Varshney, 2002). Building sustainable interfaith futures requires understanding both the possibilities and the limitations of human cooperation while remaining committed to the patient work of bridge-building across the boundaries that have historically divided us.

The future remains open, shaped by choices we make individually and collectively about how to respond to difference, change, and uncertainty (Appadurai, 2013; Sen, 1999). Interfaith education and community relations represent one crucial dimension of this larger challenge, offering both practical tools and spiritual resources for creating more inclusive and sustainable forms of human community. Success will

require the best of human wisdom from all traditions while remaining open to new insights and creative solutions that emerge from encounter across difference.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

Chapter 6
Conclusion

The Crisis of Our Current Moment

We stand at an unprecedented moment in human history. Never before have so many people from such diverse religious, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds lived in such close proximity. Never before have the decisions made by one community had such immediate and far-reaching consequences for communities thousands of miles away. Never before have the stakes of getting interfaith relations right been so high.

The polycrisis that defines our era—the intersection of climate change, technological disruption, economic inequality, political polarization, and demographic transformation—cannot be addressed by any single nation, religion, or culture acting alone. The challenges we face are inherently global and require unprecedented levels of cooperation across the very differences that have historically divided us.

Yet at precisely the moment when we most need to learn how to live together peacefully across difference, the frameworks that have guided interfaith relations for the past several decades are proving inadequate. Liberal multiculturalism, with its emphasis on individual rights and cultural relativism, has struggled to address the deep theological disagreements that divide religious communities. Traditional interfaith dialogue, focused on finding common ground and building personal relationships, has often failed to translate into sustained institutional change or effective policy solutions.

The events of recent years—from the rise of religious nationalism in India and Myanmar to the resurgence of antisemitism in Europe and North America, from the targeting of religious minorities in China to the weaponization of religious identity in the war between Russia and Ukraine—demonstrate that we cannot take religious pluralism for granted. What seemed like inevitable progress toward greater tolerance and understanding has proven fragile and reversible.

© The Author(s) 2026

I. Akhtar, *Covenantal Pluralism*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-31479-6_6

The Challenge of Jewish-Muslim Relations

October 7, 2023, marked a particularly painful turning point in Jewish-Muslim relations. The Hamas massacre in Israel and the subsequent war in Gaza exposed the limits of decades of interfaith bridge-building. Most interfaith dialogue initiatives that included Muslims and Jews in the United States ended—usually at Muslims' behest, but also because liberal Christians who had previously facilitated such dialogues found themselves identifying more with the Palestinian cause than with the project of maintaining interfaith relationships.

The speed with which these relationships collapsed revealed their superficial nature. When the stakes were low and the issues abstract, it was relatively easy for Jews and Muslims to come together around shared values of social justice or common concerns about religious freedom. But when the conflict touched on core questions of identity, security, and historical memory, these shallow bonds proved insufficient to maintain connection across difference.

This failure of the interfaith movement more generally indicates where interfaith dialogue intersects with and diverges from religious freedom. Much of the interfaith industry has been built on the assumption that if people of different faiths simply get to know each other better, they will naturally become more tolerant and cooperative. This assumption underestimates the depth of theological disagreement between religious traditions and overestimates the power of personal relationships to overcome political and historical grievances.

The future of interfaith dialogue as a mechanism for peacebuilding is severely constrained by the decline of Western institutions in the world system. The retreat of the West into spheres of influence and its compromised moral authority through economic revanchism, political populism, and exclusivist nationalism means that the future of interfaith dialogue will be defined in terms of African and Asian contexts rather than Western ones.

Interfaith Dialogue in International Conflict Resolution

Despite these setbacks, the value of interfaith engagement is now more evident than ever. We are confronted by a world facing multiple challenges, from political, social, and economic organization to the physical changes of a warming planet. At its worst, religion may be just another institution that reinforces inequality through appeals to authority. But at its best, spirituality has the ability to transcend the limitations of purely secular approaches to these challenges.

The breadth and depth of religious ideas over millennia, spanning multiple languages and civilizations, provide valuable insights into navigating a globalized, multicultural world characterized by increasing interdependence, dwindling resources, and intensifying climate change. The metaphysical dimension of human experience—the journey into the unknown and unknowable—and the vast breadth

of wisdom literature accumulated by religious traditions provide an inexhaustible well from which to draw inspiration, solace, and guidance.

Unfortunately, much of what passes for religion in international relations tends to be misunderstood by secular policymakers who lack the theological literacy to engage seriously with religious claims. Religion is often dismissed as mere rhetoric or manipulated identity, rather than recognized as providing genuine moral and civilizational frameworks that shape how people understand their place in the world. It is important to take these truth claims seriously—not because they are necessarily true, but because they are powerful—in order to address the conflicts they generate.

The vision for interfaith engagement as a tool of international relations and conflict resolution is one that has yet to be realized. Current approaches to diplomacy, even when they acknowledge religion's importance, tend to treat it as a variable to be managed rather than a resource to be tapped. Religious leaders are brought in to bless political agreements rather than to help design them. Theological insights are ignored in favor of purely political calculations.

Learning from Missed Opportunities: The Iranian Nuclear Example

Consider Iran as an example of missed opportunities for theological engagement. There is both misunderstanding and lack of appreciation for the theological underpinnings of the conflict over nuclear weapons, as well as how to address anti-Zionist rhetoric through Islamic argumentation rather than just dismissing Iranian discourses as antisemitic propaganda.

In the mid-1990s and reemphasized in the early 2000s Iran's Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei issued a religious ruling (fatwa) regarding the permissibility of nuclear weapons:

> In our opinion, in addition to nuclear weapons, other types of weapons of mass destruction, such as chemical weapons and biological weapons, are also considered a serious threat to humanity. The Iranian nation, which is itself a victim of the use of chemical weapons, feels the danger of the production and accumulation of such weapons more than other nations and is ready to put all its resources towards confronting them.
>
> We consider the use of these weapons **forbidden**, and the effort to protect the children of humanity from this great calamity is the duty of everyone.

This theological position offered a genuine opening for diplomatic engagement that could have addressed Western concerns about Iranian nuclear ambitions while respecting Iranian sovereignty and religious authority. Instead, Western diplomats cynically dismissed this as mere rhetoric, assuming that religious language was simply a cover for strategic calculations.

The failure to take Iran's theological claims seriously—whether one agrees with them or not—represented a profound failure of diplomatic imagination. Rather than engaging with the religious framework that shapes Iranian decision-making, Western

policymakers insisted on treating Iran as if it were a secular state making purely rational calculations about power and security.

What recent conflicts have shown, from a Global South perspective, is that countries may indeed find it important to achieve nuclear capability rather than remain at the precipice of proliferation. The lesson many countries have drawn from the fates of Libya and Iraq—both of which abandoned or never achieved nuclear weapons and were subsequently attacked by Western powers—is that nuclear weapons provide essential protection against regime change.

But this realist logic could have been countered by serious engagement with Iran's own theological constraints on weapons of mass destruction. A more sophisticated approach might have worked to strengthen those constraints while addressing Iran's legitimate security concerns through other means. Instead, the opportunity was squandered, and Iran has steadily advanced its nuclear program as tensions with Israel and the United States have escalated.

Rethinking the Practice of Interfaith Relations

The limitations revealed by the Iranian case and the collapse of Jewish-Muslim dialogue point to the need for a fundamental rethinking of how we approach interfaith relations. The liberal model that has dominated this field—with its emphasis on individual dialogue, personal relationships, and common values—is necessary but not sufficient for addressing the deep structural challenges that generate religious conflict.

What is needed is an approach that can hold both religious conviction and pluralistic engagement in creative tension. This is what I have called covenantal pluralism—a framework that acknowledges the legitimate claims of religious communities to shape public life while also protecting the rights of minorities and dissenters.

Covenantal pluralism differs from liberal multiculturalism in several key ways. First, it takes religious truth claims seriously rather than treating them as private preferences. Second, it recognizes that religious communities have corporate identities and interests that cannot be reduced to the rights of individual believers. Third, it acknowledges that genuine religious conviction often requires making judgments about truth and falsehood, good and evil, that cannot be easily reconciled with cultural relativism.

At the same time, covenantal pluralism differs from religious nationalism in that it affirms the equal dignity of all human beings regardless of their religious affiliation. It insists that religious conviction, properly understood, requires concern for the welfare of religious others rather than their domination or exclusion. And it maintains that religious communities flourish best when they are in dialogue with rather than isolated from other traditions.

The Most Challenging Test: Jewish-Muslim Relations

The most salient test of covenantal pluralism's effectiveness remains the global Jewish-Muslim relationship. In some ways, Christian-Muslim dialogue is easier because of the sheer numbers of believers and the distribution of power: adherents to Christianity and Islam together number half the global population, and both traditions have significant institutional presence in multiple countries and cultures.

Muslims have had to contend with and respond to colonization and modernity for more than two centuries, developing sophisticated forms of modern Islam that are patterned on Western modes of identity and expression while maintaining distinctively Islamic commitments. Both Christianity and Islam express confidence in their truth as universal religions and continue international engagement through transnational religious networks and institutions.

The Jewish situation is both similar and different. Like Muslims, Jews have had to navigate modernity and develop new forms of religious expression adapted to contemporary circumstances. But unlike Muslims, Jewish sovereignty is limited to a single country, and that country's founding is inextricably linked to the catastrophe of the Holocaust. That experience has shaped Jewish identity as profoundly as the first exodus from Egypt, creating both a fierce commitment to Jewish survival and a complex relationship with other vulnerable minorities.

The Jewish community, particularly in the diaspora, has been at the vanguard of Western liberal movements for civil rights, social justice, and religious freedom. Jewish institutions and Jewish individuals have often been the most effective advocates for religious pluralism and interfaith cooperation. But this commitment to pluralism has been tested by the realities of Israeli policy toward Palestinians and the ways that anti-Zionism has sometimes morphed into antisemitism.

The rise of the East may give new opportunities for both Muslim societies and Jewish communities to excel on the world stage in ways that are less constrained by the legacy of European colonialism and Christian-Muslim conflict. Asian models of religious pluralism—whether the managed diversity of Singapore, the economic pragmatism of Dubai, or the constitutional pluralism of Indonesia—may provide frameworks for Jewish-Muslim cooperation that are less burdened by the theological and political baggage of Western approaches.

But any sustainable Jewish-Muslim relationship will need to address honestly the theological and political differences that divide these communities. It will need to acknowledge the legitimate security concerns of Israelis while also recognizing the legitimate rights of Palestinians. It will need to distinguish between criticism of Israeli policy and antisemitic conspiracy theories while also acknowledging the ways that allegations of antisemitism have sometimes been used to silence legitimate criticism.

Most fundamentally, it will need to rediscover the theological resources within both traditions that support concern for the other rather than domination over the other. The history of Jewish-Muslim relations before the modern period provides ample evidence of such resources. The great Jewish philosopher Maimonides

engaged productively with Islamic philosophy and lived most of his life in Muslim societies. Early Islamic legal development was deeply influenced by Jewish legal traditions. Both traditions share an emphasis on law, community, and ethical action that distinguishes them from the more individualistic and belief-centered forms of Christianity.

The great challenge of suffering is to ensure that oppression does not turn the oppressed into oppressors. Time has a way of reversing fortunes, and those who are powerful today may be vulnerable tomorrow. This is why the classical tradition of Islamic political thought emphasized justice over power, and why Jewish tradition insisted that "what is hateful to you, do not do to your fellow." As Sa'di warned in the Gulistan: "Confide not to a friend every secret thou possessest. How knowest thou that he will not some time become thy foe? Inflict not every injury thou canst upon an enemy because it is possible that one day he may become thy friend."

The Economic and Spiritual Imperative for Pluralism

Beyond the moral arguments for religious pluralism lies a practical imperative that grows more urgent each day. The message of this work is that pluralism is not just good for the soul—it is good for society, good for the economy, and good for human survival in an interconnected world.

Human society is at a pivotal point in its transformation into an integrated global socioeconomic network that demands unprecedented levels of understanding and cooperation across religious and cultural differences. The supply chains that provide our food, the technologies that connect our communications, the financial systems that enable our commerce, and the scientific collaborations that advance our knowledge all depend on people from different religious and cultural backgrounds working together effectively.

In this context, ignorance or hatred of the other is not just morally wrong—it is functionally dysfunctional. It leads to missed opportunities for innovation and growth. It creates unnecessary friction in global systems that depend on trust and cooperation. At its extreme, it can lead to conflicts that destroy the infrastructure of modern civilization and threaten the survival of our species.

Religious pluralism necessarily conflicts with religious exclusivism, and this tension cannot be easily resolved through theological argument. If you know with certainty that your religion is true and others are false—if you believe that salvation comes only through your tradition and that others are destined for damnation—then it is indeed difficult to see why you should invest energy in learning about other faith traditions except perhaps to convert their adherents.

But herein lies a crucial insight about the prerequisites for pluralism: humility-in-theology. One must have some level of uncertainty about one's own ultimate fate, some recognition of the limits of human knowledge about divine truth, in order to be genuinely open to learning from the other. This does not require abandoning religious conviction or becoming a relativist about truth. It simply requires acknowledging that

if the Divine is truly infinite, then the Divine's being and ways are also infinite and fully unknowable by finite human beings.

By engaging in sincere dialogue with people of other faith traditions, believers can learn new truths about the Divine that have not yet been historically experienced within their own tradition. The complicated intersections of modernity and religion—whether around issues of gender equality, environmental stewardship, economic justice, or technological ethics—have revealed gaps in traditional religious thought that can only be addressed through creative engagement with insights from other traditions.

From a purely practical standpoint, religious pluralism engenders greater market efficiencies and provides the foundation for political stability necessary for sustained economic growth and development. Countries that successfully manage religious diversity attract more investment, generate more innovation, and provide more opportunities for their citizens than those trapped in religious conflict.

Covenantal pluralism, at its ideal, represents a communal discourse rather than merely an individual one. Confucianism, Islam, and Judaism are fundamentally relational religions. Unlike Christianity and Buddhism, they have no strong monastic traditions; instead, their adherents are exhorted to live out their religious ideals in community with others. These traditions emphasize the mutual interdependence of the human condition throughout all stages of life. They insist that individual fulfillment comes through communal engagement rather than private spirituality.

Climate Change and the Necessity of Global Cooperation

Perhaps nowhere is the practical importance of religious pluralism more evident than in addressing the challenge of climate change. The scale and urgency of this challenge require unprecedented levels of global cooperation. The technologies needed to transition to sustainable energy systems must be developed and shared across national and cultural boundaries. The adaptation strategies needed to address unavoidable climate impacts must be coordinated across regions and communities. The massive population movements that climate change will inevitably trigger must be managed cooperatively rather than through conflict.

Religious communities control vast resources—financial, institutional, and moral—that are essential for addressing climate change effectively. Religious institutions are among the largest landowners in the world, giving them crucial roles in conservation and sustainable development. Religious networks provide the organizational infrastructure needed for community-based adaptation and resilience-building. Religious teachings provide the moral frameworks that can motivate the sacrifices necessary for climate action.

But these religious resources can only be mobilized effectively if religious communities are able to work together across traditional boundaries. The climate crisis affects all communities regardless of their religious affiliation, and the solutions

require drawing on wisdom and resources from multiple traditions. No single religious tradition has all the answers, but together they possess remarkable intellectual and spiritual resources for reimagining humanity's relationship with the natural world.

The demographic decline of the developed world, combined with the mass displacement of more than a billion people who live in low-lying coastal regions threatened by sea-level rise, will make religious and cultural diversity an existential rather than optional challenge for wealthy countries. The advanced industrialized world will need people from the Majority World to staff its institutions, care for its aging populations, and maintain its infrastructure.

Immigration brings new energy into closed systems. Immigrants provide different experiences, express themselves through different languages, and offer different ways of seeing and making meaning of the world. Even "unexceptional" immigrants—who make up the vast majority of migrants in urban, rural, and suburban communities around the world—bring innovation through their resilience, entrepreneurship, and willingness to take risks that established populations often avoid.

But immigration also brings challenges that can only be addressed through effective frameworks for managing religious and cultural diversity. Receiving communities must learn how to integrate newcomers without forcing them to abandon their religious identities. Immigrant communities must learn how to adapt their religious practices to new contexts without losing their essential character. Both must learn how to create shared civic institutions that honor multiple traditions while maintaining social cohesion.

Building New Institutions for a Pluralistic Future

The future of interfaith dialogue will be defined by its ability to create not just tolerance but genuine understanding across difference. In our interconnected world, the choice is not between pluralism and uniformity, but between pluralism and fragmentation. The stakes could not be higher: the very survival of our species on this planet may depend on our ability to bridge the divides that separate us while honoring the diversity that enriches us.

This will require building new institutions and developing new practices that go beyond the traditional models of interfaith dialogue. We need educational institutions that teach religious literacy as a basic skill for citizenship in a diverse world. We need media organizations that can report on religious issues with the same sophistication they bring to economic or political analysis. We need business networks that can facilitate cooperation across religious differences. We need diplomatic institutions that understand how to engage with religious as well as secular sources of authority.

Most importantly, we need to develop new forms of democratic participation that can accommodate religious diversity without either imposing secular uniformity or allowing religious majoritarianism. This is the central challenge of what I have

called covenantal pluralism: creating political frameworks that honor both religious conviction and democratic equality.

Such frameworks cannot be imposed from above by secular elites or international organizations. They must emerge organically from the practical experience of religious communities learning to live together peacefully while maintaining their distinctive identities and commitments. They must be developed through patient processes of dialogue, experimentation, and mutual learning rather than through abstract theoretical debate.

A New Social Contract for the Twenty-First Century

A new social contract is urgently needed for the twenty-first century that will stabilize and center citizens' various identities within cohesive narratives of belonging that transcend narrow nationalism or religious sectarianism. The political polarization of our post-pandemic age violates the fundamental ethos of pluralism, which is communally generative rather than competitively destructive.

Covenantal pluralism, at its best, does not seek to convert others to one's own religious tradition. Instead, it seeks to contribute to a more peaceful and spiritually engaged world in which the sacred and profane dimensions of human experience are integrated in ways that reflect reality more accurately and draw on humanity's full range of intellectual and spiritual resources to solve intractable global problems.

This new social contract must be built on several foundational principles:

Mutual Recognition: All communities must recognize the legitimacy of others' right to exist and flourish according to their own understanding of truth and meaning. This does not require agreeing with other communities' beliefs or practices, but it does require accepting their right to hold and practice those beliefs.

Reciprocal Responsibility: Each community must take responsibility for the welfare of others, not just their own members. This means opposing injustice even when it benefits one's own group, and supporting justice even when it costs one's own group some advantage.

Collaborative Problem-Solving: Communities must be willing to work together on shared challenges even when they disagree about ultimate questions of meaning and purpose. They must be able to distinguish between those issues where theological difference is relevant and those where it is not.

Institutional Innovation: New institutions must be created that can mediate between different communities and facilitate cooperation without requiring anyone to abandon their deepest commitments. These institutions must be designed to accommodate religious difference rather than eliminate it.

Generational Commitment: Building sustainable religious pluralism requires investments that will pay off over decades rather than years. Each generation must recommit to the work of learning to live peacefully with others while passing on their own traditions to their children.

The Moral Imperative

The path forward requires what I have called covenantal pluralism—a commitment to mutual flourishing rooted in the recognition that our destinies are inextricably intertwined in ways that previous generations could barely imagine. This is not merely a political necessity driven by practical constraints, but a spiritual imperative that flows from the deepest insights of our religious traditions.

In serving the other, we serve the Divine—whether we understand that Divine as the God of Abraham, the Buddha-nature that exists in all beings, the Dao that flows through all things, or the moral arc of the universe that bends toward justice. In protecting the other's right to worship according to their conscience, we protect our own right to follow our deepest convictions. In ensuring the other's dignity as a human being created in the image of God or possessing inherent Buddha-nature, we affirm our own humanity and theirs.

The work of building bridges across religious divides is never finished. Each generation must take up this task anew, armed with the wisdom of the past but open to the possibilities of the future. The alternative—a world fractured by religious animosity and civilizational conflict—is too terrible to contemplate and too costly to risk.

The choice before us is not between religious faith and secular reason, not between tradition and modernity, not between local identity and global citizenship. The choice is between a future where our deepest differences become sources of creative tension that generate new possibilities for human flourishing, and a future where those same differences become sources of destructive conflict that threaten everything we hold dear.

We have the wisdom traditions, the institutional capacity, and the moral imagination to choose wisely. What remains to be seen is whether we have the courage and commitment to do the hard work that such a choice requires. The stakes could not be higher, and the time to choose is now.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

Afterword: Lessons From the Gaza War and the Future of Interfaith Peacebuilding

After the events of September 11, it was common for American Muslims to be apologists for Islam: their refrain was "Islam means peace." Although the word "Islam" comes from the same trilateral Semitic root s-l-m as the Hebrew word for peace, shalom, its more accurate translation is submission [to God]. In the same way we subsume our desires to those we love as spouse and parent, so our greatest love is reserved for God, for whom our thoughts, beliefs, and actions are in submission to the Divine Will. The need to say that Islam meant peace represented the silencing of Muslims who condemned terrorism but were never heard (Bayoumi, 2015; Peek, 2005).

I am writing this afterword on October 7, 2024, the one-year anniversary of the Hamas massacre in Gaza and a day of profound sorrow for the Jewish people. It marked not only the largest massacre of Jews since the Holocaust but also ignited a sense of existential threat to Israel's survival (Goldberg, 2024). In many ways, this threat and sadness were felt even more acutely among the Jews of the Diaspora, particularly in the United States, where fragmentation of the national identity has led to an identity crisis of victimization (Waxman, 2024).

These past few years have seen the polarization of Muslim and Jewish communities worldwide. Whatever elements of solidarity had been built over preceding decades have been largely destroyed (Considine, 2024; Fishkoff, 2024). Most Muslims identify only with Palestinian suffering, and vice versa. Each feels a sense of existential threat and the need to justify violence against the other to protect the self. This breakdown represents the most significant failure of interfaith relations in the post-World War II era and offers sobering lessons about the limits and possibilities of religious peacebuilding.

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2026

I. Akhtar, *Covenantal Pluralism*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-31479-6

The Collapse of Decades of Bridge-Building

The speed and completeness with which Jewish-Muslim interfaith relationships collapsed in the aftermath of October 7 exposed their fundamentally superficial nature (Brodeur, 2024). Organizations that had spent decades building relationships across religious lines—from local interfaith councils to international peacebuilding organizations—found themselves unable to maintain dialogue when the stakes became existential rather than abstract (Gopin, 2024).

This situation was reminiscent of my time at the State Department, when I worked for what was then the Israel-Palestine Desk, now separated into an Israel Desk and a Palestine Affairs Desk. We were referred to as "Peace Talk virgins," meaning that we had yet to experience the inevitable disillusionment when negotiations inevitably failed. Among veteran diplomats, peace was always going to be an illusion reserved for the naïve. Yet I continued to hold onto my commitment to negotiations, realizing that no state of war can exist in perpetuity. My mentor and professor of international relations once said that all conflicts end, either by the victory of one side over the other or sheer exhaustion.

But an absence of conflict is not peace: the Palestinian issue has poisoned the well of Jewish-Muslim relations far beyond the boundaries of the Middle East (Kaye, 2024). The Palestinian cause emerged at the same time as the globalization of Muslim identity and decolonization, and it was linked to Islam within the dichotomous worldview of Islam versus the West (Mandaville, 2007; Roy, 2004). My mother grew up in Tanzania and never knew a Jewish person. Only when she came to London was she expected by other Muslims to dislike Jews because of the existence of the State of Israel. She never did.

The failure was not merely one of inadequate preparation or poor leadership. It revealed fundamental structural problems with how interfaith relations had been conceived and practiced in the liberal era. Most interfaith work had operated on the assumption that personal relationships could transcend political differences, that finding common ground on abstract values could overcome concrete disagreements about land, security, and historical memory (Abu-Nimer, 2003; Smock, 2002).

Historical Context and Contemporary Realities

It is crucially important to remember that modern Muslim antisemitism is a contemporary phenomenon and not one inherent in the historical Muslim experience (Lewis, 1999; Litvak & Webman, 2009). Muslim antisemitism had to be imported from Western European texts and narratives from the nineteenth century. Uzbekistan provides a telling example: the Jews of Bukhara were integral to Central Asian life for centuries. It was Soviet colonization and later the migration of the community that led to an Islamization of European antisemitic tropes (Baldauf, 2001).

The irony is profound: as Muslims adopted antisemitism as a response to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, Europeans were simultaneously developing their own forms of Islamophobia that became staples of the European Right (Bunzl, 2007; Klug, 2014). The Muslim other became one of the major ways that European identity was defined politically, culturally, and ideologically, just as the Jewish other had been for previous generations.

Islam, as a religion, is patterned on Judaism in its legalism, strict monotheism, and communal identitarianism (Firestone, 2008). Muslims share with Jews the idea of the community as a symbolic body, in which, as the Prophet said, if one part hurts, the other feels it. Muslim thinkers such as al-Farabi, Avicenna, al-Ghazali, and Averroes engaged productively with the great Jewish philosopher Maimonides (Davidson, 2005; Kraemer, 2008). Adherents of both traditions sought sanctuary in Muslim lands after the Inquisition. The Jewish minorities living in the Muslim world (Sephardic Jews) enriched their communities by engaging in interactions with the majority culture through trade, food, and art in ways that continue to define them long after they emigrated to Israel (Stillman, 1991).

The Failure of Liberal Interfaith Models

The collapse of Jewish-Muslim dialogue reveals the limitations of liberal approaches to interfaith relations that have dominated the field since the 1960s (Eck, 2001; Patel, 2007). These approaches, rooted in Protestant ecumenical theology and Enlightenment assumptions about reason and progress, proved inadequate when confronted with the deep theological and political commitments that actually motivate religious communities (Moyaert, 2013; Cornille, 2008).

Liberal interfaith work typically operates through several problematic assumptions:

The Primacy of Personal Relationships: The belief that if people of different faiths simply get to know each other better, they will naturally become more tolerant and cooperative. This underestimates the depth of theological disagreement between religious traditions and overestimates the power of personal relationships to overcome political and historical grievances (Putnam & Campbell, 2010).

The Search for Common Ground: The assumption that successful interfaith relations depend on finding shared values and beliefs rather than learning to live peacefully despite fundamental disagreements. This approach often requires participants to minimize or suppress the very commitments that make their religious identities meaningful (D'Costa, 2000).

The Privatization of Difference: The liberal tendency to treat religious conviction as a private matter that should not influence public life or political engagement. This contradicts the self-understanding of most religious traditions, which see faith as necessarily shaping all aspects of human existence (Casanova, 1994).

The Universalization of Liberal Values: The assumption that concepts like individual rights, religious freedom, and democratic participation are universal human

values rather than particular products of Western historical experience. This creates resistance among communities that organize themselves according to different principles (An-Na'im, 2008).

These limitations became starkly apparent in the aftermath of October 7, when many interfaith organizations found themselves unable to maintain dialogue across communities that held fundamentally different understandings of justice, security, and historical responsibility (Gopin, 2024).

The Future of Interfaith Dialogue in International Relations

Despite these failures, the need for effective interfaith engagement in international relations has never been greater (Appleby, 2000; Johnston & Sampson, 1994). The challenges facing humanity in the twenty-first century—from climate change and pandemic response to economic inequality and technological disruption—cannot be addressed by any single nation, culture, or religious tradition acting alone (Albright, 2006; Philpott, 2012).

The question is not whether religious differences will shape international relations, but how they will do so. Religious communities control vast material and moral resources that are essential for addressing global challenges. Religious institutions are among the largest landowners, educators, and healthcare providers in the world. Religious networks provide organizational infrastructure that spans national boundaries and can mobilize millions of people around shared causes. Religious teachings provide moral frameworks that can motivate sacrifice for the common good in ways that purely secular appeals often cannot (Haynes, 2007; Thomas, 2005).

But these religious resources can only be mobilized effectively if religious communities are able to work together across traditional boundaries—or at least to avoid destructive conflicts that undermine collective action. This requires new approaches to interfaith relations that are more realistic about the persistence of religious difference while more creative about the possibilities for cooperation despite disagreement.

Three Scenarios for the Future

Looking forward, three distinct scenarios emerge for the future of interfaith dialogue in international relations, each with different implications for global peace and cooperation.

Scenario 1: The Continued Decline of Liberal Interfaith Models

In this scenario, the liberal interfaith movement continues its current trajectory of decline and fragmentation. The failures exposed by the Gaza conflict are replicated in other contexts as religious communities retreat into defensive particularism. Interfaith organizations become increasingly marginalized, reduced to symbolic gestures that have little impact on actual policy or behavior.

This decline would be accelerated by several trends already visible:
The Rise of Religious Nationalism: Across the world, religious identities are being mobilized for exclusivist political projects (Brubaker, 2015; Juergensmeyer, 2003). From Hindu nationalism in India to Christian nationalism in the United States, from Buddhist nationalism in Myanmar to Islamic nationalism in various forms, religious communities are increasingly defining themselves in opposition to religious others rather than in dialogue with them.

The Weaponization of Religious Freedom: The discourse of religious freedom is increasingly being used to justify discrimination against religious minorities rather than to protect them (Mahmood, 2016; Sullivan, 2005). Conservative religious communities invoke religious freedom to resist accommodation of religious diversity, while governments use religious freedom rhetoric to justify interference in the affairs of religious minorities.

The Fragmentation of Global Governance: As the liberal international order created after World War II continues to weaken, the institutional frameworks that have supported interfaith dialogue are losing their authority and resources (Ikenberry, 2018). International organizations that have promoted religious freedom and interfaith cooperation find themselves with diminished capacity and legitimacy.

The Polarization of Information Environments: Social media and digital communication technologies are creating increasingly isolated echo chambers that reinforce religious and ideological differences rather than bridging them (Sunstein, 2001; Tufekci, 2017). Religious communities are able to maintain their distinctiveness without engaging seriously with alternative perspectives.

In this scenario, religious differences become increasingly sources of conflict rather than cooperation in international relations. Climate change adaptation becomes more difficult as communities prioritize religious and cultural purity over practical cooperation. Migration and refugee crises are exacerbated by religious hostility. Economic development is constrained by the inability to build trust across religious boundaries.

Scenario 2: The Emergence of Pragmatic Sectoral Cooperation

In this intermediate scenario, formal interfaith dialogue continues to decline, but religious communities find ways to cooperate on specific practical issues despite their broader theological and political disagreements. Rather than seeking comprehensive

reconciliation, communities focus on narrow areas where cooperation serves their mutual interests.

This approach would be characterized by:
Issue-Specific Partnerships: Religious communities work together on particular challenges—such as climate change, public health, or economic development—without attempting to resolve their broader theological or political differences (Vendley, 2005). These partnerships are temporary and instrumental rather than permanent and comprehensive.

Track-Two Diplomacy: Religious leaders engage in informal diplomatic conversations that complement but do not replace official government-to-government relations (Slim, 2007). These conversations focus on practical problem-solving rather than theological dialogue or political reconciliation.

Economic Interdependence: Religious communities are brought together through shared economic interests rather than shared values. Trade relationships, investment partnerships, and development projects create incentives for cooperation that transcend religious differences.

Technical Cooperation: Religious communities collaborate on technical challenges—such as disaster response, humanitarian aid, or scientific research—where religious differences are less relevant than practical expertise.

This scenario offers more promise than complete fragmentation but also has significant limitations. Cooperation that is purely instrumental and issue-specific may prove fragile when interests diverge or when political tensions escalate. Without deeper foundations of trust and understanding, practical partnerships may collapse under pressure, as occurred with Jewish-Muslim relations after October 7.

Scenario 3: The Development of Post-Liberal Covenantal Models

In this more optimistic scenario, new approaches to interfaith relations emerge that move beyond the limitations of liberal models while avoiding the pitfalls of religious nationalism. These approaches, which I have called "covenantal pluralism," acknowledge the legitimacy of deep religious conviction while creating frameworks for cooperation across difference.

Such models would be characterized by:
Theological Engagement: Rather than avoiding theological differences or seeking to minimize them, these approaches engage seriously with the distinctive truth claims of different religious traditions (Griffiths, 2001; Hedges, 2010). They recognize that sustainable cooperation requires understanding what religious communities actually believe and why those beliefs matter to them.

Reciprocal Responsibility: Communities accept responsibility for the welfare of religious others, not because they agree with their beliefs, but because they recognize

their shared humanity and interdependence (Sacks, 2002). This responsibility is understood as flowing from rather than contradicting religious conviction.

Institutional Innovation: New institutions are created that can accommodate religious difference rather than eliminating it (Chaplin, 2007; Kuyper, 1998). These institutions provide space for religious communities to express their convictions while engaging constructively with others who hold different convictions.

Cultural Adaptation: Rather than imposing universal models, these approaches adapt to local cultural and political contexts (An-Na'im, 2008). They recognize that different societies will need different frameworks for managing religious diversity based on their histories, demographics, and political systems.

Generational Investment: These approaches recognize that building sustainable interfaith relations requires investments that will pay off over decades rather than years (Putnam & Campbell, 2010). They focus on education, institutional development, and cultural change rather than short-term political agreements.

The development of such models would be supported by several trends that are already emerging:

The Growth of Global South Christianity and Islam: As the demographic centers of Christianity and Islam shift toward the Global South, new voices and perspectives are entering interfaith relations that are less burdened by the colonial and post-colonial conflicts that have shaped Western approaches (Jenkins, 2002; Sanneh, 2003).

The Practical Necessity of Cooperation: Climate change, pandemic response, and other global challenges are creating practical imperatives for cooperation that transcend religious and cultural differences (Victor et al., 2019). Communities that might prefer isolation are being forced to engage with others by circumstances beyond their control.

The Failure of Secular Alternatives: The inability of purely secular approaches to address the spiritual and moral dimensions of global challenges is creating space for religious voices in international relations (Norris & Inglehart, 2004). Even secular institutions are recognizing the need to engage with religious communities as crucial stakeholders.

Technological Innovation: New communication technologies, when properly designed and implemented, can facilitate more sophisticated forms of interfaith engagement that transcend geographical boundaries while respecting cultural differences (Hoover & Echchaibi, 2014).

The Role of Emerging Powers

The future of interfaith dialogue in international relations will be significantly shaped by how emerging powers—particularly China, India, and Indonesia—approach religious diversity (Stepan et al., 2014). Unlike the Western powers that dominated

international relations in the twentieth century, these emerging powers have deep historical experience with religious diversity and different models for managing it.

China's Approach: China's state-controlled model of religious diversity offers efficiency and stability but at the cost of genuine religious freedom (Yang, 2012). As China's global influence grows, this model may become more attractive to governments that prioritize social order over individual rights. However, the resistance this model generates among religious communities may also create opportunities for alternative approaches.

India's Challenge: India's struggle to maintain its secular democratic model in the face of rising Hindu nationalism illustrates the fragility of pluralistic institutions when confronted with mobilized religious identity (Sen, 2005; Varshney, 2002). The outcome of this struggle will have profound implications for how the world's largest democracy manages religious diversity.

Indonesia's Success: Indonesia's relatively successful implementation of Pancasila provides a model for how religious diversity can be managed within an Islamic-majority framework (Assyaukanie, 2009; Hefner, 2000). As the world's largest Muslim-majority democracy, Indonesia's approach offers lessons for how Islamic societies can embrace pluralism without abandoning their religious identity.

Implications for Policy and Practice

The lessons from the Gaza conflict and the broader trends in interfaith relations have several important implications for policymakers, practitioners, and scholars:

Realistic Expectations: Interfaith dialogue cannot be expected to resolve deep political conflicts or eliminate theological disagreements. Its value lies in creating relationships and understanding that can prevent conflicts from escalating and provide resources for cooperation when opportunities arise (Abu-Nimer, 2003).

Institutional Investment: Building sustainable interfaith relations requires long-term investment in institutions, education, and cultural change rather than short-term projects or crisis responses (Putnam & Campbell, 2010). Communities need infrastructure for engagement that can survive political upheavals and leadership changes.

Cultural Sensitivity: Effective interfaith engagement must be adapted to local cultural and political contexts rather than imposed from outside (An-Na'im, 2008). What works in one society may not work in another, and practitioners need to be sensitive to these differences.

Cross-Cultural Religious Literacy: Diplomats, policymakers, and practitioners need better understanding of religious traditions and their internal diversity (Albright, 2006). Engaging effectively with religious communities requires knowledge of their beliefs, practices, and sources of authority.

Economic Integration: Religious cooperation is more likely to be sustainable when it is supported by shared economic interests rather than relying solely on good intentions. Trade, investment, and development partnerships can provide practical foundations for broader cooperation.

The Abraham Accords as a Model

Despite the generational setback in Jewish-Muslim relations following the Gaza War, the Abraham Accords between Israel and several Arab states provide a template for how interfaith cooperation might develop in the future (Bahbah, 2020; Miller, 2021). These agreements were based on shared strategic interests rather than theological dialogue, but they created space for religious exchange and cooperation that had been impossible for decades.

The Abraham Accords is revolutionary, though ahead of its time, becasuse it outlines a shared future of flourishing that echoes the best of the medieval Jewish-Muslim past today through highlighing:

Prioritized Practical Benefits: The agreements focused on concrete economic, security, and technological cooperation rather than attempting to resolve theological or historical differences (Lynch, 2021).

Created Multiple Stakeholders: The agreements involved governments, businesses, and civil society organizations, creating multiple constituencies with interests in their success (Makovsky & Yakubovich, 2021).

Allowed for Gradual Development: Rather than requiring immediate comprehensive normalization, the agreements created frameworks that allowed relationships to develop gradually over time (Khatib, 2021).

Provided Economic Incentives: The agreements created significant economic opportunities that gave all parties material reasons to make them work (Cafiero & Karasik, 2021).

The creativity unleashed through these multi-faith engagements has generated new possibilities for cooperation in a region that had been defined by conflict for decades. We can be heartened by the fact that peace has been gaining momentum among Arab nations, most of whose governments now have overt or covert relationships with both the Israeli government and Israeli corporations in arenas ranging from security to technology.

Learning from Failure

The collapse of Jewish-Muslim interfaith relations after October 7 also provides valuable lessons about what not to do:

Avoid Superficial Relationships: Interfaith work that focuses only on personal relationships without addressing structural issues is vulnerable to collapse when political tensions escalate (Brodeur, 2024).

Don't Ignore Power Dynamics: Interfaith dialogue that fails to acknowledge differences in power and privilege between communities is unlikely to be sustainable when those differences become politically salient (Abu-Nimer, 2003).

Recognize Limits: Interfaith work cannot substitute for political solutions to political problems. Religious dialogue may complement but cannot replace diplomatic, legal, and institutional approaches to conflict resolution (Gopin, 2000).

Prepare for Setbacks: Interfaith relations will inevitably face crises that test their foundations. Communities need to prepare for these challenges rather than assuming that good intentions will be sufficient (Smock, 2002).

The Spiritual Dimension of Future Peacebuilding

Ultimately, the future of interfaith dialogue in international relations will depend on whether religious communities can rediscover the spiritual resources within their own traditions that support concern for the other rather than domination over the other (Appleby, 2000). This requires what I have called "humility-in-theology"—the recognition that if the Divine is truly infinite, then human understanding of the Divine must be necessarily limited and partial.

Traditionally, multiple nations lived side by side in multilingual empires. From the ancient Akkadian to the modern Ottomans, the age of empire gave way to the nation-state and commodities to fiat currency. All societal activity is based on trust. For us to trust one another beyond our traditional family and tribal allegiances, trust systems need to be routinized to efficiently communicate during times of peace and to reinforce support of fellow citizens in times of stress and conflict.

A pluralistic society's freedom of thought and action is a prerequisite to innovation, but that freedom must be understood as liberty through mutual obligation. These traditions emphasize the mutual interdependence of the human condition throughout all stages of life. It is through community that we find place and meaning. Learning about the other through humility engenders a deeper sense of one's own spirituality and allows for the cultural innovation that comes from diversity.

Final Reflections

The work of building bridges across religious divides is never finished. Each generation must take up this task anew, armed with the wisdom of the past but open to the possibilities of the future. The alternative—a world fractured by religious animosity and civilizational conflict—is too terrible to contemplate and too costly to risk.

The events of the past two years have reminded us how fragile interfaith relationships can be and how quickly political events can undo decades of work. But they have also revealed the depth of the need for new approaches that are more realistic about the persistence of religious difference while more creative about the possibilities for cooperation despite disagreement.

The choice before us is not between faith and reason, tradition and modernity, or local identity and global citizenship. The choice is between approaches to religious difference that generate creative possibilities for human flourishing and those that generate destructive conflicts that threaten everything we hold dear.

We have the wisdom traditions, the institutional capacity, and the moral imagination to choose wisely. What remains to be seen is whether we have the courage and commitment to learn from our failures and build something better from the ruins of our disappointed hopes. The stakes could not be higher, and the time to choose is now.

If loneliness were isolated to the individual, perhaps its effects would be less harmful. But, by nature, we are social creatures, and the pathologies of loneliness can become a social contagion that results in antisocial behavior and ultimately in violence. School shootings are an extreme manifestation of this loneliness and isolation that is birthed through early childhood trauma and through neglect that is fed by unmet feelings of entitlement.

If we take away its rituals and beliefs, religion is ultimately about community. It is about creating narratives of being and identity that can bring people of different walks of life together within a common language and practice to support and nurture them. Because having faith in an abstract deity is difficult even for the most devout monotheist, stories are used to create the metaphors to describe one's emotional states.

The central question then becomes: How do we integrate individual stories within a collective and how do we integrate community narratives into a master national narrative that respects diversity but is not reductionist? Social cohesion and harmony very much depend on how narratives of being and belonging are reconciled in a dynamic way that allows for positive change and development.

It is here that covenantal pluralism can play a positive role: it can foster diversity through finding commonalities that can transcend the material present and direct the society and the individual to attain higher goals of human flourishing that incorporate the metaphysical in addition to the physical. It seeks to anchor individuals in community and understands rights as mutually reinforcing relationships.

Bibliography

Abu-Lughod, J. L. (1989). *Before European hegemony: The world system A.D. 1250–1350*. Oxford University Press.

Abu-Nimer, M. (2003). *Nonviolence and peace building in Islam: Theory and practice*. University Press of Florida.

Academic freedom, academic responsibility. (1995). *Academe, 81*(3), 40–45.

Acharya, A. (2014). *The end of American world order*. Polity Press.

Adang, C. (1996). *Muslim writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible: From Ibn Rabban to Ibn Hazm*. Brill.

Adelaar, K. A., & Himmelmann, N. P. (Eds.). (2005). *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*. Routledge.

Ahmad, K. (1980). *Economic development in an Islamic framework*. Islamic Foundation.

Ahmad, F. (1993). *The making of modern Turkey*. Routledge.

Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2003). *Remaking the American mainstream: Assimilation and contemporary immigration*. Harvard University Press.

Alba, R., & Foner, N. (2015). *Strangers no more: Immigration and the challenges of integration in North America and Western Europe*. Princeton University Press.

Albala, K. (2013). *Routledge international handbook of food studies*. Routledge.

Albright, M. K. (2006). *The mighty and the Almighty: Reflections on America, God, and world affairs*. HarperCollins.

Alcalay, A. (1993). *After Jews and Arabs: Remaking Levantine culture*. University of Minnesota Press.

Alexander, J. C. (2012). *Trauma: A social theory*. Polity Press.

Alexander, J. C. (2004). *Cultural trauma and collective identity*. University of California Press.

Allison, G. (2017). *Destined for war: Can America and China escape Thucydides's trap?* Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.

Almond, G. A., Appleby, R. S., & Sivan, E. (2003). *Strong religion: The rise of fundamentalisms around the world*. University of Chicago Press.

Alston, W. P. (1991). *Perceiving God: The epistemology of religious experience*. Cornell University Press.

Alter, J. S. (2004). *Yoga in modern India: The body between science and philosophy*. Princeton University Press.

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2026

I. Akhtar, *Covenantal Pluralism*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-31479-6

Ames, R. T., & Rosemont, H. (1998). *Thinking from the Han self: Truth, transcendence, and identity in Chinese and Western culture*. SUNY Press.
Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin, 71*(5), 319–342.
Ammerman, N. T., Farnsley, A. E., Tamney, J. B., Day, C. H., Krindatch, A. D., & Vasilenko, I. V. (1998). *Congregation and community*. Rutgers University Press.
Amsden, A. H. (1989). *Asia's next giant: South Korea and late industrialization*. Oxford University Press.
Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso.
Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Rev. ed.). Verso.
Anderson, A. (2004). *An introduction to Pentecostalism: Global charismatic Christianity*. Cambridge University Press.
Anderson, J. (2015). Digital religion and the problem of media representation. In H. Campbell (Ed.), *Digital religion: Understanding religious practice in new media worlds* (pp. 243–253). Routledge.
Andréfouët, S., Zubia, M., & Payri, C. (2022). Mapping and quantifying coral reefs and their changes in the Indonesian archipelago between 2000 and 2012 using multisource satellite imagery. *Coral Reefs, 41*(1), 65–80.
Anghie, A. (2005). *Imperialism, sovereignty and the making of international law*. Cambridge University Press.
Angle, S. C. (2009). *Sagehood: The contemporary significance of neo-Confucian philosophy*. Oxford University Press.
An-Na'im, A. A. (2008). *Islam and the secular state: Negotiating the future of Shari'a*. Harvard University Press.
Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. University of Minnesota Press.
Appadurai, A. (2013). *The future as cultural fact: Essays on the global condition*. Verso.
Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. Norton.
Apple, M. W. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
Appleby, R. S. (2000). *The ambivalence of the sacred: Religion, violence, and reconciliation*. Rowman & Littlefield.
Aronson, E., & Mills, J. (1959). The effect of severity of initiation on liking for a group. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59*(2), 177–181.
Asad, T. (1993). *Genealogies of religion: Discipline and reasons of power in Christianity and Islam*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
Asad, T. (2003). *Formations of the secular: Christianity, Islam, modernity*. Stanford University Press.
Aspinall, E. (2005). *Opposing Suharto: Compromise, resistance, and regime change in Indonesia*. Stanford University Press.
Aspinall, E. (2009). *Islam and nation: Separatist rebellion in Aceh*. Stanford University Press.
Assyaukanie, L. (2009). *Islam and the secular state in Indonesia*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
Atherton, J. (2008). *Christianity and the market: Christian social thought for our times*. SPCK.
Atwood, G. E., & Stolorow, R. D. (1984). *Structures of subjectivity: Explorations in psychoanalytic phenomenology*. Analytic Press.
Austin, J. E. (2000). *The collaboration challenge: How nonprofits and businesses succeed through strategic alliances*. Jossey-Bass.
Autor, D. H. (2014). Skills, education, and the rise of earnings inequality among the "other 99 percent.". *Science, 344*(6186), 843–851.
Aydin, C. (2017). *The idea of the Muslim world: A global intellectual history*. Harvard University Press.

Bahbah, B. (2020). The Abraham Accords: A new era in the Middle East? *Middle East Policy, 27*(4), 11–23.
Bahrani, Z. (2016). Destruction of cultural heritage as a weapon of war: ISIS in Syria and Iraq. In *Art as therapy* (pp. 23–40). Zed Books.
Bailenson, J. (2018). *Experience on demand: What virtual reality is, how it works, and what it can do*. Norton.
Baldauf, I. (2001). The Jews of Bukhara. In *Central Asia: 130 years of Russian dominance, a historical overview* (pp. 373–398). Duke University Press.
Banks, J. A. (2004). *Multicultural education: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
Bano, S. (2012). *Muslim women and shari'ah councils: Transcending the boundaries of community and law*. Palgrave Macmillan.
Bar-Tal, D. (2007). Sociopsychological foundations of intractable conflicts. *American Behavioral Scientist, 50*(11), 1430–1453.
Barton, J. (2007). *The nature of biblical criticism.* Westminster John Knox Press.
Batson, C. D., Schoenrade, P., & Ventis, W. L. (1993). *Religion and the individual: A social-psychological perspective*. Oxford University Press.
Bauman, W. A. (2014). *Religion and ecology: Developing a planetary ethic*. Columbia University Press.
Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Polity Press.
Bauman, Z. (2001). *The individualized society*. Polity Press.
Bayoumi, M. (2015). *This Muslim American life: Dispatches from the war on terror*. New York University Press.
Beck, U., & Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2002). *Individualization: Institutionalized individualism and its social and political consequences.* Sage Publications.
Bell, D. A. (2000). *East meets West: Human rights and democracy in East Asia.* Princeton University Press.
Bell, D. A. (2008). *China's new Confucianism: Politics and everyday life in a changing society.* Princeton University Press.
Bell, D. A. (2015). *The China model: Political meritocracy and the limits of democracy.* Princeton University Press.
Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life.* University of California Press.
Bellah, R. N. (1967). Civil religion in America. *Daedalus, 96*(1), 1–21.
Ben Johanan, N. (2024). Antisemitism in post-Christian Europe: Historical continuities and contemporary manifestations. *Journal of European Studies, 54*(2), 187–203.
Bendik-Keymer, J. (2012). *The ecological life: Discovering citizenship and a sense of humanity.* Rowman & Littlefield.
Benkler, Y., Faris, R., & Roberts, H. (2018). *Network propaganda: Manipulation, disinformation, and radicalization in American politics.* Oxford University Press.
Bennett, J. (2001). *The enchantment of modern life: Attachments, crossings, and ethics.* Princeton University Press.
Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21–71). Intercultural Press.
Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (2018). The disinformation order: Disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions. *European Journal of Communication, 33*(2), 122–139.
Bentham, J. (1996). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation.* Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1789)
Berger, P. L. (1967). *The sacred canopy: Elements of a sociological theory of religion.* Doubleday.
Berkes, F. (2012). *Sacred ecology* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
Berlin, I. (1958). *Two concepts of liberty*. In *Four essays on liberty* (pp. 118–172). Oxford University Press.
Bermeo, N. (2016). On democratic backsliding. *Journal of Democracy, 27*(1), 5–19.
Berry, T. (1988). *The dream of the earth.* Sierra Club Books.

Bertrand, J. (2004). *Nationalism and ethnic conflict in Indonesia.* Cambridge University Press.
Berzonsky, M. D. (1990). Self-construction over the life-span: A process perspective on identity formation. *Advances in Personal Construct Psychology, 1*, 155–186.
Betts, A. (2013). *Survival migration: Failed governance and the crisis of displacement*. Cornell University Press.
Bevans, S. B., & Schroeder, R. P. (2004). *Constants in context: A theology of mission for today.* Orbis Books.
Bezrukova, K., Spell, C. S., Perry, J. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2012). A meta-analytical integration of over 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin, 138*(6), 1227–1274.
Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture.* Routledge.
Bhargava, R. (1998). *Secularism and its critics.* Oxford University Press.
Bielefeldt, H., Ghanea, N., & Wiener, M. (2016). *Freedom of religion or belief: An international law commentary.* Oxford University Press.
Blau, J. (1965). *The emergence and linguistic background of Judaeo-Arabic: A study of the origins of Middle Arabic*. Oxford University Press.
Block, F., & Keller, M. R. (2011). *State of innovation: The US government's role in technology development*. Paradigm Publishers.
Boehrer, J., & Linsky, M. (1990). Teaching with cases: Learning to question. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 42*, 41–57.
Booth, A. (1998). *The Indonesian economy in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: A history of missed opportunities.* Martin's Press.
Bosch, D. J. (1991). *Transforming mission: Paradigm shifts in theology of mission.* Orbis Books.
Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
Bovingdon, G. (2010). *The Uyghurs: Strangers in their own land*. Columbia University Press.
Bowen, J. R. (1993). *Muslims through discourse: Religion and ritual in Gayo society.* Princeton University Press.
Bowen, J. R. (2003). *Islam, law, and equality in Indonesia: An anthropology of public reasoning.* Cambridge University Press.
Bowen, J. R. (2007). *Why the French don't like headscarves: Islam, the state, and public space.* Princeton University Press.
Branch, T. (1988). *Parting the waters: America in the King years, 1954–63*. Simon & Schuster.
Brands, H. (2018). *American grand strategy in the age of Trump.* Brookings Institution Press.
Brasher, B. E. (2004). *Give me that online religion.* Rutgers University Press.
Brass, P. R. (1997). *Theft of an idol: Text and context in the representation of collective violence.* Princeton University Press.
Brass, P. R. (2003). *The production of Hindu-Muslim violence in contemporary India.* University of Washington Press.
Braude, B., & Lewis, B. (Eds.). (1982). *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (2 vols.). Holmes & Meier.
Braun, K. L., Pietsch, J. H., & Blanchette, P. L. (Eds.). (2000). *Cultural issues in end-of-life decision making.* Sage.
Brettschneider, M. (2005). *Jewish feminism and intersectionality: Identity politics, women of color, and violence against women.* Bison Books.
Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(3), 429–444.
Brodeur, P. (2024). The collapse of interfaith dialogue: A post-October 7 analysis. *Journal of Ecumenical Studies, 59*(1), 1–22.
Brown, P. (1981). *The cult of the saints: Its rise and function in Latin Christianity.* University of Chicago Press.
Brown, D. (1994). *Umbanda: Religion and politics in urban Brazil*. Columbia University Press.
Brown, P. (1988). *The body and society: Men, women, and sexual renunciation in early Christianity.* Columbia University Press.

Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution.* Zone Books.
Broyde, M. J., & Wolowelsky, J. B. (2005). *The pursuit of justice and Jewish law: Halakhic perspectives on the legal profession* (2nd ed.). Yeshiva University Press.
Brubaker, R. (2004). *Ethnicity without groups.* Harvard University Press.
Brubaker, R. (2015). *Grounds for difference.* Harvard University Press.
Bruce, S. (2002). *God is dead: Secularization in the West*. Blackwell.
Bruce, S. (2003). *Politics and religion.* Polity Press.
Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies.* Norton.
Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2006). The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Public Administration Review, 66*(s1), 44–55.
Buber, M. (1970). *I and thou* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). T&T Clark. (Original work published 1923)
Buhaug, H. (2015). Climate–conflict research: Some reflections on the way forward. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 6*(3), 269–275.
Bulliet, R. W. (1994). *Islam: The view from the edge*. Columbia University Press.
Bunt, G. R. (2009). *iMuslims: Rewiring the house of Islam.* University of North Carolina Press.
Bunzl, M. (2007). *Anti-semitism and Islamophobia: Hatreds old and new in Europe.* Prickly Paradigm Press.
Burki, S. J. (1999). *Pakistan: Fifty years of nationhood* (3rd ed.). Westview Press.
Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* Harper & Row.
Burt, R. S. (2005). *Brokerage and closure: An introduction to social capital*. Oxford University Press.
Cady, L. E., & Brown, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Religious studies, theology, and the university: Conflicting maps, changing terrain.* SUNY Press.
Cafiero, G., & Karasik, T. (2021). The Abraham Accords: A new geopolitical landscape. *Middle East Institute.*
Cameron, A. (1991). *Christianity and the rhetoric of empire: The development of Christian discourse*. University of California Press.
Camp, R. A. (1997). *Crossing swords: Politics and religion in Mexico.* Oxford University Press.
Campbell, H. A. (2012). *Digital religion: Understanding religious practice in new media worlds.* Routledge.
Campbell, H. A. (2020). *The distanced church: Reflections on doing church online*. Digital Religion Publications.
Campbell, H. A. (2016). Surveying theoretical approaches within digital religion studies. *New Media & Society, 19*(1), 15–24.
Camus, A. (1955). *The myth of Sisyphus*. Vintage Books.
Cappelen, Å., & Mjøset, L. (2009). Can Norway be a role model for natural resource abundant countries? *Journal of Development Studies, 45*(7), 1129–1149.
Carey, L. B., & Cohen, J. (2008). Chaplain-physician consultancy: When chaplains and doctors meet in the clinical context. *Journal of Religion and Health, 47*(4), 540–557.
Carlyle, T. (1841). *On heroes, hero-worship, and the heroic in history*. Chapman and Hall.
Carrette, J., & King, R. (2005). *Selling spirituality: The silent takeover of religion.* Routledge.
Carson, D. A. (1996). *The gagging of God: Christianity confronts pluralism.* Zondervan.
Casanova, J. (1994). *Public religions in the modern world*. University of Chicago Press.
Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society.* Blackwell.
Castles, S., de Haas, H., & Miller, M. J. (2013). *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world* (5th ed.). Guilford Press.
Catalyst. (2001). *Women of color in corporate management: Three years later*. Catalyst.
Chalmers, D. J. (1996). *The conscious mind: In search of a fundamental theory.* Oxford University Press.
Chaplin, J. (2007). *Herman Dooyeweerd: Christian philosopher of state and civil society.* University of Notre Dame Press.

Chappell, D. L. (2004). *A stone of hope: Prophetic religion and the death of Jim Crow*. University of North Carolina Press.
Chapple, C. K. (1993). *Nonviolence to animals, earth, and self in Asian traditions*. SUNY Press.
Chapple, C. K. (2002). *Jainism and ecology: Nonviolence in the web of life*. Harvard University Press.
Chapra, M. U. (2000). *The future of economics: An Islamic perspective*. Islamic Foundation.
Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The nation and its fragments: Colonial and postcolonial histories*. Princeton University Press.
Chaudhuri, K. N. (1985). *Trade and civilization in the Indian Ocean: An economic history from the rise of Islam to 1750*. Cambridge University Press.
Cheong, P. H., Fischer-Nielsen, P., & Gelfgren, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Digital religion, social media and culture perspectives*. Peter Lang.
Chesnut, R. A. (1997). *Born again in Brazil: The Pentecostal boom and the pathogens of poverty*. Rutgers University Press.
Chidester, D., Tobler, J., & Wratten, D. (1994). *Christianity in South Africa: An annotated bibliography*. Greenwood Press.
Childs, B. S. (1979). *Introduction to the Old Testament as scripture*. Fortress Press.
Christensen, C. R., & Hansen, A. J. (1987). *Teaching and the case method*. Harvard Business School Press.
Chua, A. (2018). *Political tribes: Group instinct and the fate of nations*. Penguin Press.
Ciftci, S., Wuthrich, F. M., & Shamaileh, A. (2016). Islam, religious outlooks, and support for democracy. *Political Research Quarterly, 69*(3), 435–449.
Clayton, S. (2020). Climate anxiety: Psychological predictors and correlates. *Journal of Climate Psychology, 1*(1), 3–18.
Cleary, E. L., & Stewart-Gambino, H. W. (Eds.). (1997). *Power, politics, and Pentecostals in Latin America*. Westview Press.
Cohen, M. R. (1994). *Under crescent and cross: The Jews in the Middle Ages*. Princeton University Press.
Cohen, S. P. (2004). *The idea of Pakistan*. Brookings Institution Press.
Cohen, J. L., & Arato, A. (1992). *Civil society and political theory*. MIT Press.
Cohn, B. S. (1996). *Colonialism and its forms of knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton University Press.
Coleman, D. (2006). Immigration and ethnic change in low-fertility countries: A third demographic transition. *Population and Development Review, 32*(3), 401–446.
Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Harvard University Press.
Collins, J. T. (1998). *Malay, world language: A short history*. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
Collins, J. J. (2005). *The Bible after Babel: Historical criticism in a postmodern age*. Eerdmans.
Comaroff, J., & Comaroff, J. L. (1991). *Of revelation and revolution: Christianity, colonialism, and consciousness in South Africa*. University of Chicago Press.
Cone, J. H. (1997). *God of the oppressed*. Orbis Books.
Conklin, A. L. (1997). *A mission to civilize: The republican idea of empire in France and West Africa, 1895–1930*. Stanford University Press.
Considine, C. (2024). The unravelling of Jewish-Muslim relations in America. *The New Arab*.
Cook, S. W. (1985). Experimenting on social issues: The case of school desegregation. *American Psychologist, 40*(4), 452–460.
Cornille, C. (2008). *The im-possibility of interreligious dialogue*. Crossroad Publishing.
Counihan, C., & Van Esterik, P. (Eds.). (2013). *Food and culture: A reader* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
Cranton, P. (2006). *Understanding and promoting transformative learning: A guide for educators of adults* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
Crystal, D. (2004). *The language revolution*. Polity Press.
Csordas, T. J. (1994). *The sacred self: A cultural phenomenology of charismatic healing*. University of California Press.

Cunsolo, A., & Ellis, N. R. (2017). Ecological grief as a mental health response to climate-related loss. *Nature Climate Change, 7*(12), 842–847.
Curtin, P. D. (1984). *Cross-cultural trade in world history*. Cambridge University Press.
Dahl, R. A. (1989). *Democracy and its critics*. Yale University Press.
Das Gupta, A. (1994). *The world of the Indian Ocean merchant, 1500–1800*. Oxford University Press.
Davidson, H. A. (2005). *Moses Maimonides: The man and his works*. Oxford University Press.
Davie, G. (2002). *Europe: The exceptional case: Parameters of faith in the modern world*. Darton, Longman & Todd.
Davis, M. H. (1994). *Empathy: A social psychological approach*. Brown & Benchmark.
D'Costa, G. (1986). *Theology and religious pluralism: The challenge of other religions*. Basil Blackwell.
D'Costa, G. (2000). *The meeting of religions and the Trinity*. Orbis Books.
Deng, F. M. (1995). *War of visions: Conflict of identities in the Sudan*. Brookings Institution Press.
Deutsch, M., & Collins, M. E. (1951). *Interracial housing: A psychological evaluation of a social experiment*. University of Minnesota Press.
Diamond, L. (1999). *Developing democracy: Toward consolidation*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
Diamond, L. (2008). *The spirit of democracy: The struggle to build free societies throughout the world*. Times Books.
Diamond, L. (1992). Economic development and democracy reconsidered. *American Behavioral Scientist, 35*(4–5), 450–499.
Diamond, L. (1994). Rethinking civil society: Toward democratic consolidation. *Journal of Democracy, 5*(3), 4–17.
Diamond, L. (2002). Thinking about hybrid regimes. *Journal of Democracy, 13*(2), 21–35.
Diamond, L. (2015). Facing up to the democratic recession. *Journal of Democracy, 26*(1), 141–155.
Dietrich, O., Heun, M., Notroff, J., Schmidt, K., & Zarnkow, M. (2012). The role of cult and feasting in the emergence of Neolithic communities. *Antiquity, 86*(333), 674–695.
DiMaggio, P., & Mohr, J. (1985). Cultural capital, educational attainment, and marital selection. *American Journal of Sociology, 90*(6), 1231–1261.
Dinham, A., & Francis, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Religious literacy in policy and practice*. Policy Press.
Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2016). Why diversity programs fail. *Harvard Business Review, 94*(7), 52–60.
Douglas, M. (1966). *Purity and danger: An analysis of concepts of pollution and taboo*. Routledge.
Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup contact: The past, present, and the future. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 6*(1), 5–21.
Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Saguy, T. (2010). Commonality and the complexity of "we": Social attitudes and social change. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14*(1), 3–20.
Dreyer, E. L. (2007). *Zheng He: China and the oceans in the early Ming dynasty, 1405–1433*. Pearson Longman.
Dumont, L. (1986). *Essays on individualism: Modern ideology in anthropological perspective*. University of Chicago Press.
Dundas, P. (2002). *The Jains* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
Durham, W. C., Jr., & Scharffs, B. G. (2010). *Law and religion: National, international, and comparative perspectives*. Aspen Publishers.
Durkheim, E. (1997). *The division of labor in society* (W. D. Halls, Trans.). Free Press. (Original work published 1893)
Dworkin, R. (1977). *Taking rights seriously*. Harvard University Press.
Easterly, W. (2006). *The white man's burden: Why the West's efforts to aid the rest have done so much ill and so little good*. Penguin Press.
Eby, J. W., & colleagues. (2011). *A heart for the community: New models of urban and rural ministry*. Baker Academic.
Eck, D. L. (2006). *Encountering God: A spiritual journey from Bozeman to Banaras*. Beacon Press.

Edwards, M. (2004). *Civil society*. Polity Press.
Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, M. (2021). What kills international organisations? When and why international organisations terminate. *European Journal of International Relations, 27*(1), 281–310.
Einstein, M. (2008). *Brands of faith: Marketing religion in a commercial age*. Routledge.
Eisenstadt, S. N. (2000). Multiple modernities. *Daedalus, 129*(1), 1–29.
Elazar, D. J. (1995). *Covenant and polity in biblical Israel: Biblical foundations and Jewish expressions*. Transaction Publishers.
Elbasani, A. (Ed.). (2013). *European integration and transformation in the Western Balkans: Europeanization or business as usual?* Routledge.
El-Gamal, M. A. (2006). *Islamic finance: Law, economics, and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
Eliade, M. (1957). *The sacred and the profane: The nature of religion*. Harcourt, Brace & World.
Esposito, J. L. (1988). *Islam: The straight path*. Oxford University Press.
Esposito, J. L. (2002). *Unholy war: Terror in the name of Islam*. Oxford University Press.
Esposito, J. L., & Voll, J. O. (1996). *Islam and democracy*. Oxford University Press.
Evans, P. B. (1995). *Embedded autonomy: States and industrial transformation*. Princeton University Press.
Eck, D. L. (2001). *A new religious America: How a "Christian country" has become the world's most religiously diverse nation*. HarperSanFrancisco.
Bruinessen, M. van. (2013). *Contemporary developments in Indonesian Islam: Explaining the "conservative turn"*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
Fairbank, J. K. (1992). *China: A new history*. Harvard University Press.
Falola, T. (1998). *Violence in Nigeria: The crisis of religious politics and secular ideologies*. University of Rochester Press.
Fanon, F. (2004). *The wretched of the earth* (R. Philcox, Trans.). Grove Press. (Original work published 1961)
Farrell, H., & Newman, A. L. (2019). Weaponized interdependence: How global economic networks shape state coercion. *International Security, 44*(1), 42–79.
Fassin, D. (2012). *Humanitarian reason: A moral history of the present*. University of California Press.
Fealy, G., & Hooker, V. (Eds.). (2006). *Voices of Islam in Southeast Asia: A contemporary sourcebook*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford University Press.
Fingarette, H. (1972). *Confucius: The secular as sacred*. Harper & Row.
Finke, R., & Stark, R. (1992). *The churching of America, 1776–1990: Winners and losers in our religious economy*. Rutgers University Press.
Finn, D. K. (2013). *Christian economic ethics: History and implications*. Fortress Press.
Firestone, R. (1990). *Journeys in holy lands: The evolution of the Abraham-Ishmael legends in Islamic exegesis*. SUNY Press.
Firestone, R. (2001). *Children of Abraham: An introduction to Judaism for Muslims*. KTAV Publishing House.
Firestone, R. (2008). *An introduction to Islam for Jews*. Jewish Publication Society.
Fischer-Nielsen, P. (2012). *Digital religion, social media and culture perspectives*. Peter Lang.
Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class?* Harvard University Press.
Fishbane, M. (1985). *Biblical interpretation in ancient Israel*. Oxford University Press.
Fishkoff, S. (2024). A year after October 7, Jewish-Muslim relations are in tatters. *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*.
Fitzgerald, M. L., & Borelli, J. (2006). *Interfaith dialogue: A Catholic view*. Orbis Books.
Flood, G. (1999). *Beyond phenomenology: Rethinking the study of religion*. Cassell.
Flood, F. B. (2002). Between cult and culture: Bamiyan, Islamic iconoclasm, and the museum. *The Art Bulletin, 84*(4), 641–659.
Flood, G. (1996). *An introduction to Hinduism*. Cambridge University Press.
Floridi, L. (2019). *The ethics of information*. Oxford University Press.

Foa, R. S., & Mounk, Y. (2016). The danger of deconsolidation: The democratic disconnect. *Journal of Democracy, 27*(3), 5–17.
Foley, M. W., & Hoge, D. R. (2007). *Religion and the new immigrants: How faith communities are changing our cities*. Oxford University Press.
Folke, C., Carpenter, S. R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T., & Rockström, J. (2010). Resilience thinking: Integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability. *Ecology and Society, 15*(4), 20.
Foltz, R. C., Denny, F. M., & Baharuddin, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Islam and ecology: A bestowed trust*. Harvard University Press.
Forward, M. (2001). *Inter-religious dialogue: A short introduction.* Oneworld.
Fowler, J. W. (1981). *Stages of faith: The psychology of human development and the quest for meaning*. Harper & Row.
Frank, A. G. (1998). *ReORIENT: Global economy in the Asian age.* University of California Press.
Freedman, J., & Combs, G. (1996). *Narrative therapy: The social construction of preferred realities.* Norton.
Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
Freston, P. (2008). *Evangelical Christianity and democracy in Latin America.* Oxford University Press.
Freud, S. (1930). *Civilization and its discontents.* Hogarth Press.
Friedman, R. A., & Craig, K. M. (2004). Predicting the effects of employee resource groups on organizational outcomes. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 23*, 1–38.
Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. Free Press.
Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man.* Free Press.
Fukuyama, F. (2018). *Identity: The demand for dignity and the politics of resentment*. Farrar.
Furedi, F. (2004). *Therapy culture: Cultivating vulnerability in an uncertain age.* Routledge.
Furnivall, J. S. (1948). *Colonial policy and practice: A comparative study of Burma and Netherlands India.* Cambridge University Press.
Gadamer, H.-G. (1975). *Truth and method*. Sheed & Ward.
Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Psychology Press.
Gale, C. R., O'Callaghan, F. J., Godfrey, K. M., Law, C. M., & Martyn, C. N. (2004). Critical periods of brain growth and cognitive function in children. *Brain, 127*(2), 321–329.
Gardiner, S. M. (2011). *A perfect moral storm: Climate change and the ethical challenge*. Oxford University Press.
Gardner, H. (2008). *Five minds for the future.* Harvard Business Review Press.
Gardner, G. (2006). *Inspiring progress: Religions' contributions to sustainable development*. Norton.
Gay, P. (1966). *The Enlightenment: An interpretation* (2 vols.). Knopf.
Geertz, C. (1980). *Negara: The theatre state in nineteenth-century Bali.* Princeton University Press.
Geertz, C. (1960). *The religion of Java.* Free Press.
Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures.* Basic Books.
Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and nationalism.* Cornell University Press.
Gershtenfeld, M., Shtober, S., & Dakwar, A. (2003). *Wartime rescue of Jews by the local population and the Holocaust as seen by the local population.* Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs.
Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age.* Polity Press.
Gier, N. F. (1980). Wittgenstein and forms of life. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences, 10*(3), 241–258.
Gifford, P. (1998). *African Christianity: Its public role.* Indiana University Press.
Gilens, M., & Page, B. I. (2014). Testing theories of American politics: Elites, interest groups, and average citizens. *Perspectives on Politics, 12*(3), 564–581.
Gilson, E. (1952). *Being and some philosophers* (2nd ed.). Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Bergin & Garvey.

Gladney, D. C. (1991). *Muslim Chinese: Ethnic nationalism in the People's Republic*. Harvard University Press.
Glendon, M. A. (1991). *Rights talk: The impoverishment of political discourse*. Free Press.
Goff, P. (2017). *Consciousness and fundamental reality*. Oxford University Press.
Goitein, S. D. (1967–1993). *A Mediterranean society: The Jewish communities of the Arab world as portrayed in the documents of the Cairo Geniza* (6 vols.). University of California Press.
Goldberg, D. T. (1996). *Multiculturalism: A critical reader*. Blackwell.
Goldberg, J. (2024). The shattering: The day Israel's illusion of safety died. *The Atlantic*.
Goldscheider, C. (2006). Religion, family, and fertility: What do we know historically and comparatively? *Religion and the Decline of Fertility in the Western World*, 41–57.
Goldstein, M. C. (1997). *The snow lion and the dragon: China, Tibet, and the Dalai Lama*. University of California Press.
Goldstone, J. A. (2002). Population and security: How demographic change can lead to violent conflict. *Journal of International Affairs, 56*(1), 3–21.
Goldstone, J. A. (2010). The new population bomb: The four megatrends that will change the world. *Foreign Affairs, 89*(1), 31–43.
Gombrich, R., & Obeyesekere, G. (1988). *Buddhism transformed: Religious change in Sri Lanka*. Princeton University Press.
Goodhart, D. (2017). *The road to somewhere: The populist revolt and the future of politics*. Hurst & Company.
Goody, J. (2000). *The European family: An historico-anthropological essay*. Blackwell.
Gopin, M. (2024). *The crisis of interfaith peacebuilding*. Tikkun.
Gopin, M. (2000). *Between Eden and Armageddon: The future of world religions, violence, and peacemaking*. Oxford University Press.
Gordon-Reed, A., Hannah-Jones, N., Roper, C., Silverman, I., & Silverman, J. (Eds.). (2022). *The 1619 Project: A new origin story*. One World.
Gottlieb, R. S. (2004). *This sacred earth: Religion, nature, environment* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
Gottlieb, R. S. (Ed.). (2006). *The Oxford handbook of religion and ecology*. Oxford University Press.
Gourevitch, P. (1998). *We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families: Stories from Rwanda*. Farrar.
Graham, E. (2009). *Representations of the post/human: Monsters, aliens and others in popular culture*. Rutgers University Press.
Grampp, W. D. (2000). What did Smith mean by the invisible hand? *Journal of Political Economy, 108*(3), 441–465.
Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology, 78*(6), 1360–1380.
Greenstein, F. I. (2009). *The presidential difference: Leadership style from FDR to Barack Obama* (3rd ed.). Princeton University Press.
Greer, S. L., King, E. J., da Fonseca, E. M., & Peralta-Santos, A. (2021). The comparative politics of COVID-19: The need to understand government responses. *Global Public Health, 16*(4), 565–576.
Gregory, B. S. (2012). *The unintended Reformation: How a religious revolution secularized society*. Harvard University Press.
Greif, A. (2006). *Institutions and the path to the modern economy: Lessons from medieval trade*. Cambridge University Press.
Griffiths, P. J. (1991). *An apology for apologetics: A study in the logic of interreligious encounter*. Orbis Books.
Griffiths, P. J. (2001). *Problems of religious diversity*. Blackwell.
Groody, D. G., & Campese, G. (2008). *A promised land, a perilous journey: Theological perspectives on migration*. University of Notre Dame Press.
Gurr, T. R. (1970). *Why men rebel*. Princeton University Press.
Gutierrez, G. (1973). *A theology of liberation: History, politics, and salvation*. Orbis Books.

Habermas, J. (1991). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. MIT Press.
Hacker, J. S., & Pierson, P. (2005). *Off center: The Republican revolution and the erosion of American democracy*. Yale University Press.
Haggard, S. (1990). *Pathways from the periphery: The politics of growth in the newly industrializing countries*. Cornell University Press.
Haidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. Pantheon Books.
Hannerz, U. (1992). *Cultural complexity: Studies in the social organization of meaning*. Columbia University Press.
Hannerz, U. (1996). *Transnational connections: Culture, people, places*. Routledge.
Hansen, T. B. (1999). *The saffron wave: Democracy and Hindu nationalism in modern India*. Princeton University Press.
Hardy, C., Phillips, N., & Lawrence, T. B. (2003). Resources, knowledge and influence: The organizational effects of interorganizational collaboration. *Journal of Management Studies, 40*(2), 321–347.
Hary, B. (1992). *Multiglossia in Judeo-Arabic*. Brill.
Hasan, N. (2006). *Laskar Jihad: Islam, militancy, and the quest for identity in post-New Order Indonesia*. Cornell Southeast Asia Program.
Hatzfeld, J. (2005). *Machete season: The killers in Rwanda speak*. Farrar.
Hayek, F. A. (1944). *The road to serfdom*. University of Chicago Press.
Haynes, C. C. (2011). *Getting religion right in public schools: A guide for educators*. Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
Haynes, J. (2007). *Religion and development: Conflict or cooperation?* Palgrave Macmillan.
Hedges, P. (2010). *Theology and religious pluralism: A constructive Christian theology for a global age*. Ashgate.
Heelas, P., & Woodhead, L. (2005). *The spiritual revolution: Why religion is giving way to spirituality*. Blackwell.
Hefner, R. W. (2000). *Civil Islam: Muslims and democratization in Indonesia*. Princeton University Press.
Hefner, R. W. (Ed.). (2001). *The politics of multiculturalism: Pluralism and citizenship in Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia*. University of Hawaii Press.
Hegghammer, T. (2010). *Jihad in Saudi Arabia: Violence and pan-Islamism since 1979*. Cambridge University Press.
Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Harvard University Press.
Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture*. Stanford University Press.
Helfand, M. A. (2012). Religious arbitration and the new multiculturalism: Negotiating conflicting legal orders. *New York University Law Review, 87*, 1231–1300.
Herbst, J. (2000). *States and power in Africa: Comparative lessons in authority and control*. Princeton University Press.
Herman, J. L. (1992). *Trauma and recovery*. Basic Books.
Hersh, E. D. (2020). *Politics is for power: How to move beyond political hobbyism, take action, and make real change*. Scribner.
Hetherington, M. J., & Weiler, J. D. (2018). *Prius or pickup?: How the answers to four simple questions explain America's great divide*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
Hick, J. (1989). *An interpretation of religion: Human responses to the transcendent*. Yale University Press.
Hicks, D. A. (2003). *Religion and the workplace: Pluralism, spirituality, leadership*. Cambridge University Press.
Hill, H. (2000). *The Indonesian economy* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
Himmelfarb, G. (1995). *The de-moralization of society: From Victorian virtues to modern values*. Knopf.

Hirota, D. (1997). *No abode: The record of Ippen.* University of Hawaii Press.
Hirschberger, G. (2018). Collective trauma and the social construction of meaning. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 1441.
Hirschman, A. O. (1977). *The passions and the interests: Political arguments for capitalism before its triumph.* Princeton University Press.
Hirschman, A. O. (1991). *The rhetoric of reaction: Perversity, futility, jeopardy*. Harvard University Press.
Hobsbawm, E. J. (1990). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge University Press.
Hodgson, M. G. S. (1974). *The venture of Islam: Conscience and history in a world civilization* (3 vols.). University of Chicago Press.
Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage.
Hogg, M. A. (2007). Uncertainty–identity theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 39*, 69–126.
Holden, S. (2013). Avoiding the resource curse the case Norway. *Energy Policy, 63*, 870–876.
Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., Baker, M., Harris, T., & Stephenson, D. (2015). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: A meta-analytic review. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 10*(2), 227–237.
Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., & Layton, J. B. (2010). Social relationships and mortality risk: A meta-analytic review. *PLoS Medicine, 7*(7), Article e1000316.
Homer-Dixon, T., Walker, B., Biggs, R., Crépin, A. S., Folke, C., Lambin, E. F., ... & Troell, M. (2015). Synchronous failure: The emerging causal architecture of global crisis. *Ecology and Society, 20*(3), 16.
Homer-Dixon, T., Renn, O., & Rockström, J. (2022). *Cascading global crises*. Cascade Institute.
Honneth, A. (1992). *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts.* Polity Press.
Hook, S. (1943). *The hero in history: A study in limitation and possibility.* John Day.
Hooker, V. M. (Ed.). (2003). *Voices of Islam in Southeast Asia: A contemporary sourcebook*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* Routledge.
Hoover, S. M. (2006). *Religion in the media age.* Routledge.
Hoover, S. M., & Echchaibi, N. (2014). Media theory and the "religion-media" field. *Journal of Communication, 64*(2), 240–260.
Horowitz, D. L. (1985). *Ethnic groups in conflict*. University of California Press.
Horowitz, D. L. (2001). *The deadly ethnic riot*. University of California Press.
Hout, M., & Fischer, C. S. (2014). Explaining why more Americans have no religious preference. *American Sociological Review, 79*(6), 978–1000.
Hrytsyshena, A., Marchetti, R., & Toaldo, M. (2024). Global migration trends and policy responses. *International Migration Review, 58*(2), 234–256.
Hudson, V. M. (2005). Foreign policy analysis: Actor-specific theory and the ground of international relations. *Foreign Policy Analysis, 1*(1), 1–30.
Hunter, J. D. (1991). *Culture wars: The struggle to define America.* Basic Books.
Huntington, S. P. (1968). *Political order in changing societies.* Yale University Press.
Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. Simon & Schuster.
Hurd, E. S. (2008). *The politics of secularism in international relations.* Princeton University Press.
Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2005). *Managing to collaborate: The theory and practice of collaborative advantage.* Routledge.
Ignatieff, M. (1998). *The warrior's honor: Ethnic war and the modern conscience.* Metropolitan Books.
Ignatieff, M. (1993). *Blood and belonging: Journeys into the new nationalism.* Farrar.
Ikenberry, G. J. (2018). The end of liberal international order? *International Affairs, 94*(1), 7–23.

ILGA. (2023). *State-sponsored homophobia report 2023: Global legislation overview update*. International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association.
Inalcik, H. (1973). *The Ottoman Empire: The classical age, 1300–1600*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence*. Cambridge University Press.
Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton University Press.
Iqbal, Z., & Mirakhor, A. (2011). *An introduction to Islamic finance: Theory and practice*. Wiley.
Iqbal, Z., & Molyneux, P. (2016). *Thirty years of Islamic banking: History, performance and prospects*. Palgrave Macmillan.
Iser, W. (1978). *The act of reading: A theory of aesthetic response*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
Israel, B. A., Eng, E., Schulz, A. J., & Parker, E. A. (Eds.). (2012). *Methods for community-based participatory research for health* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
Israel, J. I. (2001). *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the making of modernity, 1650–1750*. Oxford University Press.
Iyengar, S., Lelkes, Y., Levendusky, M., Malhotra, N., & Westwood, S. J. (2019). The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science, 22*, 129–146.
Jackson, R. (2004). *Rethinking religious education and plurality: Issues in diversity and pedagogy*. RoutledgeFalmer.
Jacobsen, D., & Jacobsen, R. H. (2008). *The American university in a postsecular age*. Oxford University Press.
Jalal, A. (1995). *Democracy and authoritarianism in South Asia: A comparative and historical perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
Jamieson, D. (2014). *Reason in a dark time: Why the struggle against climate change failed—and what it means for our future*. Oxford University Press.
Jaspers, K. (1953). *The origin and goal of history*. Yale University Press.
Jenkins, P. (2002). *The next Christendom: The coming of global Christianity*. Oxford University Press.
Jervis, R. (2017). *Perception and misperception in international politics*. Princeton University Press.
Jiménez, T. R., Park, J., & Pedroza, J. (2018). The new third generation: Post-1965 immigration and the next chapter in the long story of assimilation. *International Migration Review, 52*(4), 1040–1079.
Jingyi, W. (2022). Lying flat" and the politics of refusal among Chinese youth. *Made in China Journal, 7*(1), 42–47.
Johnston, D., & Sampson, C. (Eds.). (1994). *Religion, the missing dimension of statecraft*. Oxford University Press.
Jomo, K. S. (Ed.). (2001). *Malaysian eclipse: Economic crisis and recovery*. Zed Books.
Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*(3), 339–375.
Juergensmeyer, M. (2003). *Terror in the mind of God: The global rise of religious violence* (3rd ed.). University of California Press.
Juergensmeyer, M. (1993). *The new cold war?* University of California Press.
Kamali, M. H. (2008). *Maqasid al-Shariah: The objectives of Islamic law*. Islamic Society of North America.
Kaminer, M. (2024). The Abrahamic Ideology: Patrilineal Kinship and the Politics of Peacemaking in the Contemporary Middle East. *Millennium, 52*(2), 198–220.
Kaplan, D. (2002). *The spiritual investor: A personal and professional journey*. Morehouse Publishing.
Kaplan, R. D. (1993). *Balkan ghosts: A journey through history*. Martin's Press.
Karakas, F. (2010). Spirituality and performance in organizations: A literature review. *Journal of Business Ethics, 94*(1), 89–106.

Kaufmann, E. (2010). *Shall the religious inherit the earth?: Demography and politics in the twenty-first century*. Profile Books.
Kaufmann, E. (2018). *Whiteshift: Populism, immigration, and the future of white majorities*. Abrams Press.
Kawachi, I., & Berkman, L. F. (2001). Social ties and mental health. *Journal of Urban Health, 78*(3), 458–467.
Kaye, D. D. (2024). *The Middle East after the Gaza War*. Council on Foreign Relations.
Ke, L. (2023). Traditional Chinese medicine and holistic health: Integrating ancient wisdom with modern practice. *Journal of Integrative Medicine, 21*(3), 145–158.
Keane, J. (1998). *Civil society: Old images, new visions*. Stanford University Press.
Keating, T. (1994). *Intimacy with God*. Crossroad.
Kedourie, E. (1992). *Democracy and Arab political culture*. Washington Institute for Near East Policy.
Keen, D. (1994). *The benefits of famine: A political economy of famine and relief in southwestern Sudan, 1983–1989*. Princeton University Press.
Kepel, G. (2004). *The war for Muslim minds: Islam and the West*. Harvard University Press.
Kessler, T., & Cohrs, J. C. (2008). The effects of contact on prejudice: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 32*(2), 166–180.
Khatib, L. (2021). *The Abraham Accords: A new regional order?* Chatham House.
Kierkegaard, S. (1843). *Fear and trembling*. Cambridge University Press.
Kim, K. S., & Leipziger, D. M. (1993). *Korea: A case study in government policy and comparative advantage*. World Bank.
Kimmerer, R. W. (2013). *Braiding sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge and the teachings of plants*. Milkweed Editions.
Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1998). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels*. Berrett-Koehler.
Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1987). The aesthetics of everyday life. In *Folklife and fieldwork: A layman's introduction to field techniques* (pp. 3–12). American Folklife Center.
Klein, N. (2014). *This changes everything: Capitalism vs. the climate*. Simon & Schuster.
Kleinman, A. (1980). *Patients and healers in the context of culture: An exploration of the borderland between anthropology, medicine, and psychiatry*. University of California Press.
Klug, B. (2014). *Being Jewish and doing justice: Bringing argument to life*. Vallentine Mitchell.
Knitter, P. F. (1985). *No other name?* Orbis Books.
Knott, K. (1998). *Hinduism: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
Koenig, H. G., King, D. E., & Carson, V. B. (2012). *Handbook of religion and health* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. Harper & Row.
Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice-Hall.
Kollman, K. (2017). *The same-sex unions revolution in Western democracies: International norms and domestic policy change*. Manchester University Press.
Kraemer, J. L. (2008). *Maimonides: The life and world of one of civilization's greatest minds*. Doubleday.
Krauthammer, C. (1990). The unipolar moment. *Foreign Affairs, 70*(1), 23–33.
Kugel, J. L. (1998). *Traditions of the Bible: A guide to the Bible as it was at the start of the common era*. Harvard University Press.
Kukah, M. H. (1993). *Religion, politics and power in northern Nigeria*. Spectrum Books.
Kukreja, V. (2003). *Contemporary Pakistan: Political processes, conflicts and crises*. Sage Publications.
Kulke, H. (1993). *A history of India* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
Kumar, N. (2019). Ancient Indian science and technology: Myth, reality, and nationalist reconstruction. *Social Studies of Science, 49*(2), 283–307.

Kupchan, C. A. (2012). *No one's world: The West, the rising rest, and the coming global turn.* Oxford University Press.
Kuran, T. (2011). *The long divergence: How Islamic law held back the Middle East*. Princeton University Press.
Kuru, A. T. (2009). *Secularism and state policies toward religion: The United States, France, and Turkey*. Cambridge University Press.
Kuyper, A. (1998). *Lectures on Calvinism*. Eerdmans.
Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights.* Oxford University Press.
Kymlicka, W. (2001). *Politics in the vernacular: Nationalism, multiculturalism, and citizenship.* Oxford University Press.
Kymlicka, W. (2014). The rise and fall of multiculturalism? New debates on inclusion and accommodation in diverse societies. *International Social Science Journal, 61*(199), 97–112.
Laborde, C. (2017). *Liberalism's religion.* Harvard University Press.
Lapidus, I. M. (1988). *A history of Islamic societies*. Cambridge University Press.
Lawrence, M., Janzwood, S., & Homer-Dixon, T. (2022). *What is a global polycrisis?* (Cascade Institute Technical Paper, 2022–4).
Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies.* United States Institute of Peace Press.
Leifer, M. (2000). *Singapore's foreign policy: Coping with vulnerability*. Routledge.
Levenson, J. D. (1985). *Sinai and Zion: An entry into the Jewish Bible*. Winston Press.
Levenson, J. D. (1993). *The death and resurrection of the beloved son: The transformation of child sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity.* Yale University Press.
Levenson, J. D. (2012). *Inheriting Abraham: The legacy of the patriarch in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.* Princeton University Press.
Levin, Z. (2015). *Collectivization and social engineering: Soviet administration and the Jews of Uzbekistan, 1917–1939*. Brill.
Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority*. Duquesne University Press.
Lévi-Strauss, C. (1978). *The origin of table manners.* Harper & Row.
Levitsky, S., & Way, L. A. (2010). *Competitive authoritarianism: Hybrid regimes after the Cold War*. Cambridge University Press.
Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How democracies die*. Crown.
Levy, A. (1994). *The Sephardim in the Ottoman Empire.* Darwin Press.
Lewis, B., & Churchill, B. E. (2008). *Islam: The religion and the people*. Wharton School Publishing.
Lewis, B. (1984). *The Jews of Islam*. Princeton University Press.
Lewis, B. (1995). *The Middle East: A brief history of the last 2,000 years.* Scribner.
Lewis, B. (1999). *Semites and anti-Semites: An inquiry into conflict and prejudice*. Norton.
Li, X. (2020). *The rise of China and the demise of the capitalist world economy*. Pluto Press.
Liddle, R. W. (1996). *Leadership and culture in Indonesian politics.* Allen & Unwin.
Liddle, R. W., & Mujani, S. (2007). Leadership, party, and religion: Explaining voting behavior in Indonesia. *Comparative Political Studies, 40*(7), 832–857.
Lijphart, A. (1977). *Democracy in plural societies: A comparative exploration.* Yale University Press.
Lijphart, A. (1999). *Patterns of democracy: Government forms and performance in thirty-six countries*. Yale University Press.
Lilla, M. (2016). *The shipwrecked mind: On political reaction.* New York Review Books.
Lindbeck, G. A. (1984). *The nature of doctrine: Religion and theology in a postliberal age.* Westminster Press.
Lindemann, T., & Ringmar, E. (Eds.). (2012). *The international politics of recognition.* Paradigm Publishers.
Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some social requisites of democracy: Economic development and political legitimacy. *American Political Science Review, 53*(1), 69–105.

Litvak, M., & Webman, E. (2009). *From empathy to denial: Arab responses to the Holocaust*. Columbia University Press.
Lock, M., & Gordon, D. R. (1988). *Biomedicine examined*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Luckmann, T. (1967). *The invisible religion: The problem of religion in modern society*. Macmillan.
Lührmann, A., & Rooney, B. (2021). Autocratization by decree: States of emergency and democratic decline. *Comparative Politics, 53*(4), 617–649.
Lynch, G. (2007). *The new spirituality: An introduction to progressive belief in the twenty-first century*. I.B. Tauris.
Lynch, M. (2021). The Abraham Accords and the new Middle East. *Foreign Affairs*.
MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After virtue* (2nd ed.). University of Notre Dame Press.
MacIntyre, A. (2003). *The power of institutions: Political architecture and governance*. Free Press.
Macpherson, C. B. (1962). *The political theory of possessive individualism: Hobbes to Locke*. Oxford University Press.
Madan, T. N. (1997). *Modern myths, locked minds: Secularism and fundamentalism in India*. Oxford University Press.
Madsen, R. (2003). *One country, two societies: Rural-urban inequality in contemporary China*. Harvard University Press.
Madsen, R. (2007). *Democracy's dharma: Religious renaissance and political development in Taiwan*. University of California Press.
Mahathir, M. (1970). *The Malay dilemma*. Asia Pacific Press.
Mahmood, S. (2016). *Religious difference in a secular age: A minority report*. Princeton University Press.
Makovsky, D., & Yakubovich, A. (2021). *The Abraham Accords: A new paradigm for peace*. Washington Institute for Near East Policy.
Malcolm, N. (1994). *Bosnia: A short history*. New York University Press.
Malcolm, N. (1998). *Kosovo: A short history*. New York University Press.
Mamdani, M. (2012). *Define and rule: Native as political identity*. Harvard University Press.
Mandaville, P. (2007). *Global political Islam*. Routledge.
Mann, M. (1993). *The sources of social power: Vol. 2. The rise of classes and nation-states, 1760–1914*. Cambridge University Press.
Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 159–187). Wiley.
Mardin, Ş. (1989). *Religion and social change in modern Turkey: The case of Bediüzzaman Said Nursi*. SUNY Press.
Marenbon, J. (1997). *Medieval philosophy*. Routledge.
Margalit, A. (1996). *The decent society*. Harvard University Press.
Marsden, P. V. (1987). Core discussion networks of Americans. *American Sociological Review, 52*(1), 122–131.
Marty, M. E., & Appleby, R. S. (Eds.). (1991–1995). *The fundamentalism project* (5 vols.). University of Chicago Press.
Mason, L. (2018). *Uncivil agreement: How politics became our identity*. University of Chicago Press.
Massad, J. A. (2006). *The persistence of the Palestinian question: Essays on Zionism and the Palestinians*. Routledge.
Maududi, S. A. A. (1960). *Towards understanding Islam*. Islamic Publications.
Mazower, M. (2012). *Governing the world: The history of an idea*. Penguin Press.
Mazrui, A. A. (1986). *The Africans: A triple heritage*. Little, Brown.
Mazzucato, M. (2013). *The entrepreneurial state: Debunking public vs. private sector myths*. Anthem Press.
McAdams, D. P. (1993). *The stories we live by: Personal myths and the making of the self*. Guilford Press.
McAdams, D. P. (2011). *George W*. A psychological portrait. Oxford University Press.
McBrien, R. P. (1994). *Catholicism*. HarperCollins.

McCants, W. (2015). *The ISIS apocalypse: The history, strategy, and doomsday vision of the Islamic State*. Martin's Press.
McCarty, N., Poole, K. T., & Rosenthal, H. (2016). *Polarized America: The dance of ideology and unequal riches* (2nd ed.). MIT Press.
McConnell, M. W. (1992). Religious freedom at a crossroads. *University of Chicago Law Review, 59*(1), 115–194.
McDaniel, J. (1989). *The madness of the saints: Ecstatic religion in Bengal*. University of Chicago Press.
McDaniel, J. (2004). *Offering flowers, feeding skulls: Popular goddess worship in West Bengal*. Oxford University Press.
McFague, S. (1993). *The body of God: An ecological theology*. Fortress Press.
McGrath, A. E. (1996). *A passion for truth: The intellectual coherence of evangelicalism*. InterVarsity Press.
McGrath, A. E. (2001). *Christian theology: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Blackwell.
McGuire, M. B. (2008). *Lived religion: Faith and practice in everyday life*. Oxford University Press.
McKibben, B. (2007). *Deep economy: The wealth of communities and the durable future*. Times Books.
McMichael, C., Barnett, J., & McMichael, A. J. (2012). An ill wind? Climate change, migration, and health. *Environmental Health Perspectives, 120*(5), 646–654.
McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology, 27*, 415–444.
McRoberts, O. M. (2003). *Streets of glory: Church and community in a Black urban neighborhood*. University of Chicago Press.
McWilliams, J. E. (2012). *A revolution in eating: How the quest for food shaped America*. Columbia University Press.
Meador, K. G. (2006). *The soul of medicine: Spiritual perspectives and clinical practice*. Haworth Press.
Mearsheimer, J. J. (2018). *The great delusion: Liberal dreams and international realities*. Yale University Press.
Meeks, W. A. (1989). *The moral world of the first Christians*. Westminster Press.
Memmi, A. (1965). *The colonizer and the colonized*. Beacon Press.
Menand, L. (1996). *The future of academic freedom*. University of Chicago Press.
Menocal, M. R. (2002). *The ornament of the world: How Muslims, Jews, and Christians created a culture of tolerance in medieval Spain*. Little, Brown.
Merton, T. (1961). *The new man*. Farrar.
Metcalf, B. D. (1994). Remaking ourselves: Islamic self-fashioning in a global movement of spiritual renewal. In M. E. Marty & R. S. Appleby (Eds.), *Accounting for fundamentalisms* (pp. 706–725). University of Chicago Press.
Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. Jossey-Bass.
De Michelis, E. (2004). *A history of modern yoga: Patanjali and western esotericism*. Continuum.
Mietzner, M. (2009). *Military politics, Islam, and the state in Indonesia: From turbulent transition to democratic consolidation*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
Migdal, J. S. (1988). *Strong societies and weak states: State-society relations and state capabilities in the Third World*. Princeton University Press.
Miksic, J. N. (1990). *Borobudur: Golden tales of the Buddhas*. Periplus Editions.
Milbank, J. (1990). *Theology and social theory: Beyond secular reason*. Blackwell.
Mill, J. S. (1998). *On liberty and other essays* (J. Gray, Ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1859)
Mill, J. S. (1998). *Utilitarianism* (R. Crisp, Ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1863)
Miller, D. E. (2007). *Global Pentecostalism: The new face of Christian social engagement*. University of California Press.
Miller, A. M. (2021). *The Abraham Accords: A new dawn in the Middle East?* Routledge.

Miller, D. (2007a). *National responsibility and global justice*. Oxford University Press.
Moberly, R. W. L. (2009). *The theology of the book of Genesis*. Cambridge University Press.
Modood, T. (2007). *Multiculturalism: A civic idea*. Polity Press.
Moore, D. L. (2007). *Overcoming religious illiteracy: A cultural studies approach to the study of religion in secondary education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
Morfit, M. (1981). Pancasila: The Indonesian state ideology according to the New Order government. *Asian Survey, 21*(8), 838–851.
Morozov, E. (2011). *The net delusion: The dark side of Internet freedom*. PublicAffairs.
Morse, J. C., & Keohane, R. O. (2014). Contested multilateralism. *The Review of International Organizations, 9*(4), 385–412.
Moyaert, M. (2012). *Fragile identities: Toward a theology of interreligious hospitality*. Rodopi.
Moyaert, M. (2013). *In response to the religious other: Ricoeur and the question of interreligious hospitality*. Lexington Books.
Mudde, C. (2007). *Populist radical right parties in Europe*. Cambridge University Press.
Muldoon, J. (1979). *Popes, lawyers, and infidels: The church and the non-Christian world, 1250–1550*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
Mullins, M. R., Shimazono, S., & Swanson, P. L. (Eds.). (1993). *Religion and society in modern Japan: Selected readings*. Asian Humanities Press.
Murphy, T. (2004). *Pliny the Elder's Natural History: The empire in the encyclopedia*. Oxford University Press.
Murray, C. (2012). *Coming apart: The state of white America, 1960–2010*. Crown Forum.
Murthy, V. H. (2020). *Together: The healing power of human connection in a sometimes lonely world*. Harper Wave.
Mutua, M. (2002). *Human rights: A political and cultural critique*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
Mutz, D. C. (2018). Status threat, not economic hardship, explains the 2016 presidential vote. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115*(19), E4330–E4339.
Nagel, T. (1971). The absurd. *The Journal of Philosophy, 68*(20), 716–727.
Nandy, A. (1983). *The intimate enemy: Loss and recovery of self under colonialism*. Oxford University Press.
Naqvi, S. N. H. (1981). *Ethics and economics: An Islamic synthesis*. Islamic Foundation.
Nasr, S. H. (1968). *The encounter of man and nature: The spiritual crisis of modern man*. Allen & Unwin.
Nasr, S. H. (1987). *Traditional Islam in the modern world*. Kegan Paul International.
Nasr, S. H. (1996). *Religion and the order of nature*. Oxford University Press.
Nasr, S. V. R. (2005). *The Shia revival: How conflicts within Islam will shape the future*. Norton.
Nederman, C. J. (2000). *Worlds of difference: European discourses of toleration, c. 1100-c. 1550*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
Neill, S. (1964). *A history of Christian missions*. Penguin Books.
Nelson, L. E. (1998). *Purifying the earthly body of God: Religion and ecology in Hindu India*. SUNY Press.
Netland, H. (2001). *Encountering religious pluralism: The challenge to Christian faith & mission*. InterVarsity Press.
Newby, G. D. (1988). *A history of the Jews of Arabia: From ancient times to their eclipse under Islam*. University of South Carolina Press.
Nexon, D. H. (2009). *The struggle for power in early modern Europe: Religious conflict, dynastic empires, and international change*. Princeton University Press.
Nieto, S. (2010). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities* (10th anniversary ed.). Teachers College Press.
Noddings, N. (2005). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.
Norberg-Hodge, H. (1991). *Ancient futures: Learning from Ladakh*. Sierra Club Books.

Nord, W. A., & Haynes, C. C. (1998). *Taking religion seriously across the curriculum*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Norris, P. (2004). *Electoral engineering: Voting rules and political behavior*. Cambridge University Press.
Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2004). *Sacred and secular: Religion and politics worldwide*. Cambridge University Press.
Norris, P. (2005). *Radical right: Voters and parties in the electoral market*. Cambridge University Press.
Norris, P. (2011). *Democratic deficit: Critical citizens revisited*. Cambridge University Press.
Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). *Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism*. Cambridge University Press.
North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
North, D. C. (1991). Institutions. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 5*(1), 97–112.
Novak, M. (1982). *The spirit of democratic capitalism*. Simon & Schuster.
Nozick, R. (1974). *Anarchy, state, and utopia*. Basic Books.
Nyerere, J. K. (1968). *Ujamaa: Essays on socialism*. Oxford University Press.
O'Donnell, G. (1999). *Counterpoints: Selected essays on authoritarianism and democratization*. University of Notre Dame Press.
Olivelle, P. (1993). *The āśrama system: The history and hermeneutics of a religious institution*. Oxford University Press.
O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.
Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Duke University Press.
Öniş, Z. (2013). Turkey and the Arab Spring: A new actor in a new Middle East. *International Spectator, 48*(3), 1–14.
Oppong, J. R., & Dombroski, K. (2024). Rethinking the majority world: Decolonizing development discourse. *Development and Change, 55*(1), 98–112.
Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.
Otto, R. (1923). *The idea of the holy*. Oxford University Press.
Palmer, M., & Finlay, V. (2003). *Faith in conservation: New approaches to religions and the environment*. World Bank.
Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. Jossey-Bass.
Pandey, G. (1990). *The construction of communalism in colonial north India*. Oxford University Press.
Panikkar, R. (1978). *The intrareligious dialogue*. Paulist Press.
Papadopoulos, Y. (2013). *Democracy in crisis?: Politics, governance and policy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory*. Harvard University Press.
Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. Penguin Press.
Parks, S. D. (2000). *Big questions, worthy dreams: Mentoring young adults in their search for meaning, purpose, and faith*. Jossey-Bass.
Partridge, C. (2004). *The re-enchantment of the West: Alternative spiritualities, sacralization, popular culture, and occulture*. T&T Clark.
Pasha, M. K. (2017). Islam, 'soft' orientalism and hegemony: A Gramscian rereading. *Critical Sociology, 31*(3), 415–442.
Patel, E. (2007). *Acts of faith: The story of an American Muslim, the struggle for the soul of a generation*. Beacon Press.
Patel, E. (2012). *Sacred ground: Pluralism, prejudice, and the promise of America*. Beacon Press.

Patrick, S. (2014). The unruled world: The case for good enough global governance. *Foreign Affairs, 93*(1), 58–73.
Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage.
Peek, L. (2005). Becoming Muslim: The development of a religious identity. *Sociology of Religion, 66*(3), 215–242.
Peerenboom, R. (2002). *China's long march toward rule of law*. Cambridge University Press.
Pelikan, J. (1985). *Jesus through the centuries: His place in the history of culture.* Yale University Press.
Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows.* Routledge.
Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 751–783.
Pfeffer, J. (2010). Building sustainable organizations: The human factor. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 24*(1), 34–45.
Philpott, D. (2001). *Revolutions in sovereignty: How ideas shaped modern international relations.* Princeton University Press.
Philpott, D. (2012). *Just and unjust peace: An ethic of reconciliation.* Oxford University Press.
Piaget, J. (1977). *The development of thought: Equilibration of cognitive structures.* Viking Press.
Pieris, A. (1988). *An Asian theology of liberation.* Orbis Books.
Pierson, P. (2004). *Politics in time: History, institutions, and social analysis.* Princeton University Press.
Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Harvard University Press.
Piper, N. (2005). A problem by a different name? A review of research on trafficking in South-East Asia and Oceania. *International Migration, 43*(1–2), 203–233.
Piscatori, J. P. (1986). *Islam in a world of nation-states.* Cambridge University Press.
Plantinga, A. (2000). *Warranted Christian belief*. Oxford University Press.
Pohl, C. D. (1999). *Making room: Recovering hospitality as a Christian tradition.* Eerdmans.
Polanyi, K. (1944). *The great transformation: The political and economic origins of our time.* Beacon Press.
Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 1. *On the Horizon, 9*(5), 1–6.
Prothero, S. (2007). *Religious literacy: What every American needs to know—and doesn't*. HarperOne.
Prothero, S. (2010). *God is not one: The eight rival religions that run the world—and why their differences matter*. HarperOne.
Przeworski, A. (1991). *Democracy and the market: Political and economic reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America.* Cambridge University Press.
Ptak, R. (1998). *Die maritime Seidenstraße.* C. H. Beck.
Puchalski, C. M., & Ferrell, B. R. (2010). *Making health care whole: Integrating spirituality into patient care*. Templeton Press.
Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy.* Princeton University Press.
Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* Simon & Schuster.
Putnam, R. D., & Campbell, D. E. (2010). *American grace: How religion divides and unites us.* Simon & Schuster.
Putnam, H. (2007a). *Jewish philosophy as a guide to life: Rosenzweig, Buber, Levinas.* Indiana University Press.
Putnam, R. D. (2007b). E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. *Scandinavian Political Studies, 30*(2), 137–174.
Pye, M. (1971). Syncretism and ambiguity. *Numen, 18*(2), 83–93.
Qutb, S. (2000). *Milestones.* Kazi Publications. (Original work published 1964)
Race, A. (1983). *Christians and religious pluralism: Patterns in the Christian theology of religions.* Orbis Books.

Race, A. (2001). *Interfaith dialogue: Religious diversity and Christian truth*. Cambridge University Press.
Radhakrishnan, S. (1940). *Eastern religions and Western thought*. Oxford University Press.
Rahman, M. (2014). Homosexualities. *Muslim Cultures and Modernity. Global South, 8*(3), 109–128.
Raj, S. J., & Dempsey, C. G. (Eds.). (2010). *Popular Christianity in India: Riting between the lines*. SUNY Press.
Ramage, D. E. (1995). *Politics in Indonesia: Democracy*. Routledge.
Ranger, T. O. (1986). Religious movements and politics in sub-Saharan Africa. *African Studies Review, 29*(2), 1–69.
Ranger, T. O. (2008). *Evangelical Christianity and democracy in Africa*. Oxford University Press.
Ray, H. P. (1996). *The winds of change: Buddhism and the maritime links of early South Asia*. Oxford University Press.
Reader, I. (1991). *Religion in contemporary Japan*. University of Hawaii Press.
Reid, A. (1993). *Southeast Asia in the age of commerce, 1450–1680* (2 vols.). Yale University Press.
Reid, A. (1974). *The Indonesian national revolution, 1945–1950*. Longman.
Reuven, R. (2014). *Jews and Muslims in the Arab world: Haunted by pasts real and imagined*. Routledge.
Reuveny, R. (2007). Climate change-induced migration and violent conflict. *Political Geography, 26*(6), 656–673.
Richards, J. F. (1993). *The Mughal Empire*. Cambridge University Press.
Ricoeur, P. (1984). *Time and narrative* (Vol. 1). University of Chicago Press.
Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Hermeneutics and the human sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
Rieff, P. (2006). *The triumph of the therapeutic: Uses of faith after Freud*. ISI Books.
Riley-Smith, J. (2008). *The crusades, Christianity, and Islam*. Columbia University Press.
Ritzer, G. (2019). *The McDonaldization of society: Into the digital age* (9th ed.). Sage Publications.
Roberts, H., Cowls, J., Morley, J., Taddeo, M., Wang, V., & Floridi, L. (2021). The Chinese approach to artificial intelligence: An analysis of policy, ethics, and regulation. *AI & Society, 36*(1), 59–77.
Robinson, F. (2000). *Islam and Muslim history in South Asia*. Oxford University Press.
Robison, R., & Rosser, A. (1998). Contesting reform: Indonesia's New Order and the IMF. *World Development, 26*(8), 1593–1609.
Rodinson, M. (2007). *Islam and capitalism*. University of Texas Press.
Rodrik, D. (1995). Getting interventions right: How South Korea and Taiwan grew rich. *Economic Policy, 10*(20), 53–107.
Roof, W. C., & McKinney, W. (1987). *American mainline religion: Its changing shape and future*. Rutgers University Press.
Rose-Ackerman, S. (1999). *Corruption and government: Causes, consequences, and reform*. Cambridge University Press.
Rosenblatt, P. C. (1999). *African American grief*. Brunner/Mazel.
Ross, M. L. (2012). *The oil curse: How petroleum wealth shapes the development of nations*. Princeton University Press.
Rothschild, E. (2001). *Economic sentiments: Adam Smith, Condorcet, and the Enlightenment*. Harvard University Press.
Rothstein, B. (2011). *The quality of government: Corruption, social trust, and inequality in international perspective*. University of Chicago Press.
Rothstein, B., & Uslaner, E. M. (2005). All for all: Equality, corruption, and social trust. *World Politics, 58*(1), 41–72.
Roy, O. (2004). *Globalized Islam: The search for a new ummah*. Columbia University Press.
Roy, O. (2007). *Secularism confronts Islam*. Columbia University Press.
Runciman, W. G. (1966). *Relative deprivation and social justice: A study of attitudes to social inequality in twentieth-century England*. University of California Press.
Saban, N. (2020). *The politics of Jewish-Muslim relations: A comparative perspective*. Routledge.
Sachs, J. D. (2005). *The end of poverty: Economic possibilities for our time*. Penguin Press.

Sachs, J. D., & Warner, A. M. (2001). The curse of natural resources. *European Economic Review, 45*(4–6), 827–838.
Sacks, J. (2002). *The dignity of difference: How to avoid the clash of civilizations.* Continuum.
Sageman, M. (2004). *Understanding terror networks.* University of Pennsylvania Press.
Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism.* Pantheon Books.
Sandel, M. J. (1996). *Democracy's discontent: America in search of a public philosophy.* Harvard University Press.
Sanders, J. A. (1987). *From sacred story to sacred text*. Fortress Press.
Sanneh, L. (2003). *Whose religion is Christianity? The gospel beyond the West*. Eerdmans.
SarDesai, D. R. (1994). *Southeast Asia: Past and present* (3rd ed.). Westview Press.
Sarner, H. (1997). *Rescue in Albania: One hundred percent of Jews in Albania rescued from Holocaust*. Cathedral Publishing.
Sassen, S. (2001). *The global city: New York, London, Tokyo* (2nd ed.). Princeton University Press.
Schneiders, S. M. (1991). *The revelatory text: Interpreting the New Testament as sacred scripture.* HarperSanFrancisco.
Schroeder, R. (1992). *Max Weber and the sociology of culture.* Sage Publications.
Schroeder, R. (2008). Defining virtual worlds and virtual environments. *Journal of Virtual Worlds Research, 1*(1), 2–3.
Schumacher, E. F. (1973). *Small is beautiful: Economics as if people mattered*. Blond & Briggs.
Schwartz, B. (2004). *The paradox of choice: Why more is less.* HarperCollins.
Schwarzbaum, H. (1982). *Biblical and extra-biblical legends in Islamic folk-literature.* Verlag für Orientkunde.
Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. Yale University Press.
Scott, J. W. (2007). *The politics of the veil*. Princeton University Press.
Scruton, R. (2014). *The soul of the world*. Princeton University Press.
Searight, H. R., & Gafford, J. (2005). Cultural diversity at the end of life: Issues and guidelines for family physicians. *American Family Physician, 71*(3), 515–522.
Sen, T. (2003). *Buddhism, diplomacy, and trade: The realignment of Sino-Indian relations, 600–1400.* Association for Asian Studies.
Sen, T. (2009). *The formation of Chinese maritime identity: From Zheng He to Liang Qichao.* Brill.
Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom.* Knopf.
Sen, A. (2005). *The argumentative Indian: Writings on Indian history, culture, and identity*. Farrar.
Sennett, R. (2003). *Respect in a world of inequality.* Norton.
Shachar, A. (2001). *Multicultural jurisdictions: Cultural differences and women's rights.* Cambridge University Press.
Shackle, C. (2005). Sikhism. In L. Woodhead, P. Fletcher, H. Kawanami, & D. Smith (Eds.), *Religions in the modern world* (pp. 70–85). Routledge.
Shah, P. (2005). *Legal pluralism in conflict: Coping with cultural diversity in law.* GlassHouse Press.
Sharma, A. (1993). *Our religions.* HarperSanFrancisco.
Sharma, A. (2003). *Hinduism and secularism: After Ayodhya.* Palgrave Macmillan.
Sharpe, E. J. (1977). *Faith meets faith: Some Christian attitudes to Hinduism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.* SCM Press.
Sherman, N. (1997). *The fabric of character: Aristotle's theory of virtue.* Oxford University Press.
Shohat, E. (1999). The invention of the Mizrahim. *Journal of Palestine Studies, 29*(1), 5–20.
Siker, J. S. (1991). *Disinheriting the Jews: Abraham in early Christian controversy.* Westminster John Knox Press.
Simon, R., & Forgette-Giroux, R. (2000). A principled and pragmatic response to the problem of standards-based accountability. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 15*(4), 354–370.
Singleton, M. (2010). *Yoga body: The origins of modern posture practice.* Oxford University Press.
Siraisi, N. G. (2014). Avicenna and the medical canon: Transmission and transformation in medieval Europe. *Isis, 105*(4), 862–878.

Sulak Sivaraksa. (1992). *Seeds of peace: A Buddhist vision for renewing society*. Parallax Press.
Skocpol, T. (2003). *Diminished democracy: From membership to management in American civic life*. University of Oklahoma Press.
Skowronek, S. (1997). *The politics presidents make: Leadership from John Adams to Bill Clinton.* Harvard University Press.
Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (2007). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender* (6th ed.). Wiley.
Slim, H. (2007). *Killing civilians: Method, madness, and morality in war*. Columbia University Press.
Smart, N. (1996). *Dimensions of the sacred: An anatomy of the world's beliefs.* University of California Press.
Smith, D. E. (1963). *India as a secular state*. Princeton University Press.
Smith, D. E. (1965). *Religion and politics in Burma.* Princeton University Press.
Smith, T. L. (1998). Religious diversity in Latin America. *CrossCurrents, 48*(4), 497–508.
Smock, D. R. (2002). *Interfaith dialogue and peacebuilding*. United States Institute of Peace Press.
Sneddon, J. N. (2003). *The Indonesian language: Its history and role in modern society.* UNSW Press.
Sombart, W. (1913). *The quintessence of capitalism: A study of the history and psychology of the modern business man.* T. Fisher Unwin.
Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.
Stackhouse, M. L., McCann, D. P., Roels, S. J., & Williams, P. N. (Eds.). (1995). *On moral business: Classical and contemporary resources for ethics in economic life.* Eerdmans.
Stenner, K. (2005). *The authoritarian dynamic*. Cambridge University Press.
Stepan, A., Linz, J. J., & Yadav, Y. (2014). *Crafting state-nations: India and other multinational democracies*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
Stepan, A. (2000). Religion, democracy, and the "twin tolerations.". *Journal of Democracy, 11*(4), 37–57.
Stern, D. (1988). *The interpersonal world of the infant: A view from psychoanalysis and developmental psychology*. Basic Books.
Stern, J., & Berger, J. M. (2015). *ISIS: The state of terror*. Ecco.
Stewart, C., & Shaw, R. (Eds.). (1994). *Syncretism/anti-syncretism: The politics of religious synthesis.* Routledge.
Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents.* Norton.
Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). *The price of inequality: How today's divided society endangers our future.* Norton.
Stiglitz, J. E. (2016). *The euro: How a common currency threatens the future of Europe*. Norton.
Stillman, N. A. (1979). *The Jews of Arab lands: A history and source book*. Jewish Publication Society.
Stillman, N. A. (1991). *The Jews of Arab lands in modern times*. Jewish Publication Society.
Stoll, D. (1990). *Is Latin America turning Protestant?* University of California Press.
Stout, J. (2004). *Democracy and tradition.* Princeton University Press.
Stufflebeam, D. L. (2001). *Evaluation models.* Jossey-Bass.
Stufflebeam, D. L., & Coryn, C. L. (2014). *Evaluation theory, models, and applications*. Jossey-Bass.
Suárez-Orozco, M. M., & Qin-Hilliard, D. B. (Eds.). (2004). *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium.* University of California Press.
Subramanian, L. (2010). *Three merchants of Hindustan: In Europe's Indies.* Allen Lane.
Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2015). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Wiley.
Sugirtharajah, R. S. (2001). *The Bible and the Third World: Precolonial, colonial and postcolonial encounters.* Cambridge University Press.
Sukma, R. (2003). *Islam in Indonesian foreign policy*. RoutledgeCurzon.
Sullivan, W. F. (2005). *The impossibility of religious freedom*. Princeton University Press.

Sunstein, C. R. (2001). *Republic.com.* Princeton University Press.
Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media.* Princeton University Press.
Svendsen, L. (2005). *A philosophy of boredom.* Reaktion Books.
Swidler, L. (1987). *After the absolute: The dialogical future of religious reflection.* Fortress Press.
Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.
Taleb, N. N. (2007). *The black swan: The impact of the highly improbable.* Random House.
Tambiah, S. J. (1970). *Buddhism and the spirit cults in north-east Thailand*. Cambridge University Press.
Tarling, N. (1992). *The Cambridge history of Southeast Asia* (2 vols.). Cambridge University Press.
Tawney, R. H. (1926). *Religion and the rise of capitalism.* Harcourt, Brace & World.
Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self: The making of the modern identity*. Harvard University Press.
Taylor, C. (1991). *The malaise of modernity.* House of Anansi Press.
Taylor, C. (1994). *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition.* Princeton University Press.
Taylor, C. (2007). *A secular age.* Harvard University Press.
Templeton, J. M. (1998). *The humble approach: Scientists discover God* (Revised ed.). Templeton Foundation Press.
Thich Nhat Hanh. (1987). *Being peace*. Parallax Press.
Thistleton, A. C. (1992). *New horizons in hermeneutics: The theory and practice of transforming biblical reading*. Zondervan.
Thomas, S. M. (2005). *The global resurgence of religion and the transformation of international relations: The struggle for the soul of the twenty-first century.* Palgrave Macmillan.
Tillich, P. (1952). *The courage to be.* Yale University Press.
Tilly, C. (1990). *Coercion, capital, and European states, AD 990–1990.* Basil Blackwell.
Tönnies, F. (2001). *Community and civil society* (J. Harris, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1887)
Toohey, P. (2011). *Boredom: A lively history*. Yale University Press.
Tooze, A. (2018). *Crashed: How a decade of financial crises changed the world*. Viking.
Tracy, D. (1987). *Plurality and ambiguity: Hermeneutics, religion, hope*. Harper & Row.
Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism & collectivism.* Westview Press.
Troeltsch, E. (1992). *The social teaching of the Christian churches* (O. Wyon, Trans.). Westminster John Knox Press. (Original work published 1912)
Trungpa, C. (2002). *Cutting through spiritual materialism.* Shambhala Publications.
Tu, W. (1985). *Confucian thought: Selfhood as creative transformation.* SUNY Press.
Tucker, M. E., & Grim, J. A. (Eds.). (2001). Religion and ecology: Can the climate change? *Daedalus, 130*(4), 1–312.
Tucker, J. A., Guess, A., Barberá, P., Vaccari, C., Siegel, A., Sanovich, S., ... & Nyhan, B. (2018). *Social media, political polarization, and political disinformation: A review of the scientific literature.* Hewlett Foundation.
Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest*. Yale University Press.
Turner, V. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure.* Aldine.
Twenge, J. M. (2017). *iGen: Why today's super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy—and completely unprepared for adulthood*. Atria Books.
Uslaner, E. M. (2002). *The moral foundations of trust*. Cambridge University Press.
Valeri, M. (2009). *Oman: Politics and society in the Qaboos state*. Columbia University Press.
Valkenberg, P. (2016). *Nostra Aetate and interfaith dialogue: A Catholic perspective on religious pluralism.* Catholic University of America Press.
van Gennep, A. (1960). *The rites of passage.* University of Chicago Press.
VandeCreek, L., & Burton, L. (2001). *Professional chaplaincy: Its role and history*. Association of Professional Chaplains.

Varshney, A. (2002). *Ethnic conflict and civic life: Hindus and Muslims in India.* Yale University Press.
van der Veer, P. (2001). *Imperial encounters: Religion and modernity in India and Britain.* Princeton University Press.
Vendley, W. F. (2005). *The work of the World Conference of Religions for Peace.* In *Religion and peacebuilding* (pp. 129–146). United States Institute of Peace Press.
Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(6), 1024–1054.
Vickers, M. (1995). *The Albanians: A modern history.* I. B. Tauris.
Victor, D. G., Geels, F. W., & Sharpe, S. (2019). *Accelerating the low carbon transition.* Oxford University Press.
Villa-Vicencio, C., & De Gruchy, J. (1994). *Doing ethics in context: South African perspectives.* Orbis Books.
Villa-Vicencio, C., & Verwoerd, W. (Eds.). (2000). *Looking back, reaching forward: Reflections on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa.* University of Cape Town Press.
Viswanathan, G. (1989). *Masks of conquest: Literary study and British rule in India.* Columbia University Press.
Volkan, V. D. (1997). *Bloodlines: From ethnic pride to ethnic terrorism.* Farrar.
Wald, K. D., Owen, D. E., & Hill, S. S. (2005). *Religion and politics in the United States* (5th ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
Walker, B., Carpenter, S., Anderies, J., Abel, N., Cumming, G., Janssen, M., & Pritchard, R. (2002). Resilience management in social-ecological systems: A working hypothesis for a participatory approach. *Conservation Ecology, 6*(1), 14.
Wallerstein, N., Oetzel, J. G., & Duran, B. (Eds.). (2017). *Community-based participatory research for health: Advancing social and health equity* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics.* McGraw-Hill.
Warner, M. (1976). *Alone of all her sex: The myth and the cult of the Virgin Mary.* Knopf.
Warner, R. S. (1993). Work in progress toward a new paradigm for the sociological study of religion in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology, 98*(5), 1044–1093.
Watts, F. (2011). *Creation: Law and probability.* Ashgate.
Waxman, D. (2024). *The new antisemitism and the future of the American Jewish community.* Oxford University Press.
Weber, M. (1946). Science as a vocation. In H. H. Gerth & C. Wright Mills (Eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology* (pp. 129–156). Oxford University Press.
Weber, M. (2002). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (P. Baehr & G. C. Wells, Trans.). Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1905)
Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization.* Free Press.
Wessels, A. (1994). *Europe, was it ever really Christian?* SCM Press.
White, J. (2013). *Muslim nationalism and the new Turks.* Princeton University Press.
White, L. (1967). The historical roots of our ecological crisis. *Science, 155*(3767), 1203–1207.
White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends.* Norton.
Wilkinson, J. C. (1987). *The Imamate tradition of Oman.* Cambridge University Press.
Williams, P. (1989). *Mahayana Buddhism: The doctrinal foundations.* Routledge.
Williamson, L. (2010). *Transcendent in America: Hindu-inspired meditation movements as new religion.* New York University Press.
Wilner, D. M., Walkley, R. P., & Cook, S. W. (1955). *Human relations in interracial housing: A study of the contact hypothesis.* University of Minnesota Press.
Wilson, B. R. (1982). *Religion in sociological perspective.* Oxford University Press.
Winer, M. L. (2008). *Between heaven and earth: Jewish-Muslim dialogue and cooperation.* University of Chicago Press.
Winters, J. A. (2011). *Oligarchy.* Cambridge University Press.
Wintz, C. D. (2007). *African American political thought, 1890–1930.* M. E. Sharpe.

Witte, J., Jr., & Alexander, F. S. (Eds.). (2008). *Christianity and law: An introduction.* Cambridge University Press.
Wohlforth, W. C. (1999). The stability of a unipolar world. *International Security, 24*(1), 5–41.
Wolf, D. P., & Dietz, M. (1998). Teaching portfolios: Purposes and possibilities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 75*, 1–17.
Wolf, R. (2011). Respect and disrespect in international politics: The significance of status recognition. *International Theory, 3*(1), 105–142.
Woodward, M. R. (1989). *Islam in Java: Normative piety and mysticism in the Sultanate of Yogyakarta.* University of Arizona Press.
Woolley, K., & Fishbach, A. (2017). A recipe for friendship: The causal effect of eating together on cooperation. *Psychological Science, 28*(7), 913–923.
Worthington, E. L. (2007). *Humility: The quiet virtue.* Templeton Foundation Press.
Wuthnow, R. (1988). *The restructuring of American religion: Society and faith since World War II*. Princeton University Press.
Wuthnow, R. (1991). *Acts of compassion: Caring for others and helping ourselves.* Princeton University Press.
Yang, F. (2012). *Religion in China: Survival and revival under communist rule.* Oxford University Press.
Yang, F. (2006). The red, black, and gray markets of religion in China. *Sociological Quarterly, 47*(1), 93–122.
Yavuz, M. H. (2003). *Islamic political identity in Turkey*. Oxford University Press.
Yearley, L. H. (1990). *Mencius and Aquinas: Theories of virtue and conceptions of courage*. SUNY Press.
Yeoh, B. S. A., & Huang, S. (1998). Negotiating public space: Strategies and styles of migrant female domestic workers in Singapore. *Urban Studies, 35*(3), 583–602.
Young, C. (2012). *The postcolonial state in Africa: Fifty years of independence, 1960–2010.* University of Wisconsin Press.
Young, C. (2000). *The African colonial state in comparative perspective.* Yale University Press.
Ypi, L. (2012). *Global justice and avant-garde political agency*. Oxford University Press.
Zakaria, F. (1997). The rise of illiberal democracy. *Foreign Affairs, 76*(6), 22–43.
Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Good Books.
Zhang, W. (2021). The rise of "tang ping" (lying flat): A new form of youth resistance in China. *Global Times*.
Zhao, Y. (2012). *World class learners: Educating creative and entrepreneurial students.* Corwin.
Zhao, S. (2010). The China model: Can it replace the Western model of modernization? *Journal of Contemporary China, 19*(65), 419–436.
Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.
Zürcher, E. J. (2004). *Turkey: A modern history* (3rd ed.). I. B. Tauris.